



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-104
Wednesday
30 May 1990

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-104

CONTENTS

30 May 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze on All-European Security Structure [IZVESTIYA 30 May]	1
Kulikov on United Germany in NATO, Warsaw Pact [Hamburg DPA]	3
NATO Planning Committee Document Viewed [IZVESTIYA 25 May]	4
Gerasimov Briefing on Jewish Settlement Issues [Kuwait KUNA]	4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev Makes Pre-Summit Visit to Canada	5
Canadians Anticipate Visit [TASS]	5
Preparations, Mood in Ottawa Noted [IZVESTIYA 30 May]	5
Itinerary in Canada, U.S. Reported [Moscow Radio]	6
Gorbachev Meets Governor-General [TASS]	6
First Day of Visit Reported [Moscow Radio]	7
Shevardnadze, Clark Discuss Issues [TASS]	7
PRAVDA's Frolov Receives Canadian Editor [PRAVDA 19 May]	8
Gerasimov Holds UN News Conference on Summit [TASS]	8
PRAVDA Sets U.S. Scene for Upcoming Summit [30 May]	8
Hope, Expectations for Upcoming Summit Expressed	10
Bush Kennebunkport Remarks Quoted [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 30 May]	10
Bush Interview Comments Detailed [PRAVDA 26 May]	10
Bush News Conference Remarks Noted [IZVESTIYA 26 May]	11
More Pre-Summit Comments by Bush [IZVESTIYA 27 May]	11
Prospects of Summit Viewed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 May]	11
'Agreements' Expected at Summit [TASS]	12
Economic 'Miracle' Not Expected [PRAVDA 28 May]	13
'Partnership' Seen as Summit's Aim [PRAVDA 27 May]	15
Bessmertnykh on U.S. Preparations for Summit [TASS]	16
Solton Reviews Past U.S.-Soviet Summits [Moscow International]	16
James Baker Denies 'Sell-Out' to Soviet Union [IZVESTIYA 24 May]	17
U.S. 'Linkage' of Trade to Politics Criticized [TASS]	18
PRAVDA Assesses U.S.-Soviet Trade Prospects [24 May]	18
U.S. Senator Analyzes Soviet Economic Problems [IZVESTIYA 30 May]	19

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Speech on Asia-Pacific Policy Expected [Tokyo TV]	20
Soviet-DPRK Economic, Science Ties Analyzed [Moscow International]	20
Kim Il-song Reelection as DPRK President Noted [Moscow International]	21
DPRK Hands Over Remains of Five U.S. Soldiers [Moscow International]	21
Japan's Apology to Korean People Analyzed [Moscow International]	21

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S.-Philippine Military Base Negotiations Slow	21
Deadlock in Talks Reviewed [Moscow International]	21
Resumption of Talks Announced [Moscow International]	22
Pressure for Bases' Retention Reported [Moscow International]	22

Near East & South Asia

International Middle East Conference Urged [TASS]	22
TASS Reports Renewed Violence in Afghanistan	23
Pakistani-Indian Relations Seen Deteriorating [PRAVDA 29 May]	23

Sub-Saharan Africa

Superpowers' Role in Ethiopian Solution Viewed [Moscow International]	23
Moiseyev Meets With Mozambican Chief of Staff [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 May]	24

East Europe

Zubkov Interviews Southern Force Commander [Moscow TV]	24
Nikitin Meets Bulgarian Agriculture Minister [IZVESTIYA 23 May]	25
Dubcek Holds News Conference in Moscow [Moscow International]	25
Effects of Czechoslovak Price Hike Examined [PRAVDA 28 May]	27
Protocol Signed on Property in GDR [TASS]	27
CPSU Greet Hungarian Socialists' Congress [PRAVDA 26 May]	27
Editor Comments on Hungary's Plans, Leaders [Moscow International]	27
SFRY's Jovic Thanks Gorbachev [PRAVDA 26 May]	28

West Europe

FRG's Genscher on Cooperation With USSR [TASS]	28
Genscher Backing for Shevardnadze Proposals Cited [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 30 May]	29
Kulikov Comments on German Unity, Internal Order [Vienna TV]	29
Shevardnadze on Austrian 'Permanent Neutrality' [Vienna Radio]	29
Turkish Parliamentary Delegation Pays Visit [TASS]	29
Lukyanov Receives Parliamentarians [TASS]	30
Future of Relations With Turkey 'Brilliant' [Ankara ANATOLIA 26 May]	30
Falin Meets Visiting Danish Communist Leader [TASS]	30

Latin America & Caribbean

PRAVDA Reports on 'Cuban Shield' Exercises [20 May]	30
---	----

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Carries 29 May Supreme Soviet Session	32
Session Opens, Laptev Chairs	32
Economic Reform Debate	32
Deputies Debate Reform Points	33
Evening Session Begins	34
Ryzhkov Urges More Work	34
Ryzhkov Summarizes Economic Debate [Moscow Radio]	35
Further Ryzhkov Remarks [Moscow TV]	41
Ryzhkov Interviewed on Price Increases [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 May]	42
Ryzhkov Defends Economic Blueprint [TASS]	43
Supreme Soviet Debates Government Economic Report [Moscow Radio]	44
Many Variations Suggested [Moscow TV]	45
Decision Postponed [TASS]	45
No-Confidence Vote Rejected [Moscow Radio]	45
Debates Continue on Economic Program 28 May [Moscow TV]	46
'Anti-Market' Speeches Noted [TASS]	47
Ryzhkov 25 May Press Conference Summed Up [PRAVDA 26 May]	47
Supreme Soviet Response to Ryzhkov Report [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 May]	49

Political & Social

Gorbachev Interviewed on Boris Yeltsin	[Moscow TV]	50
'Unity' Group Hits 'Revisionist' Gorbachev	[MOSCOW NEWS 20 May]	50
Gorbachev's Ability To Organize Referendum Viewed	[London TV]	52
Gorbachev Sends Greetings to Slavonic Festival	[TASS]	53
Primakov Interviewed on Economy, Ideology	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 May]	53
Osipyan Views Presidential Council's Work	[NEDELYA No 19]	56
Ligachev Interviewed on Concept of Market Reform	[Moscow Radio]	62
Ligachev, Medvedev Address Editors' Course	[IZVESTIYA 24 May]	63
Nishanov Discusses Nationalities Legislation	[PRAVDA 29 May]	63
Leader of Democratic Platform Interviewed	[Moscow Radio]	65
Democratic Platform Comes Out Against Split	[TRUD 28 Apr]	66
Aeroflot's Problems, Shortcomings Highlighted	[Moscow TV]	67
Flaws Exist in AIDS Prevention Campaign	[TASS]	67
Weekly Supplement on Glasnost To Be Published	[TASS]	68
Residents Polled on Transition to Market Economy	[Moscow International]	68

Economic

Defense Plant Converts to Consumer Production	[Moscow TV]	68
Some Collective Farm Members Reject Leaseholding	[Moscow TV]	68
Ship Unloading Delays, Railcar Shortage Reported	[Moscow TV]	69
*Savings Withdrawals Linked to Instability	[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No 21, May 90]	69

Agricultural

Kremlin Meeting on Agricultural Priorities Noted	[IZVESTIYA 23 May]	70
Outbreak of Cattle Disease Reported in Kazakhstan	[IZVESTIYA 27 May]	71

Scientific

'Resurs-F' Photographic Satellite Launched 29 May	[TASS]	72
AIDS Conference Opens in Leningrad	[TASS]	72

Military

Kulikov Denies Rumors of Military Putsch	[Vienna DER STANDARD 30 May]	72
Yazov Says Combat Readiness Affected by Cuts	[TASS]	73
Lizichev Meets Baltic Military District Troops	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 May]	73
'Tbilisi' Carrier Undergoes Performance Trials	[TASS]	73

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis To Travel to CSFR via Moscow	[Prague Radio]	75
Lauds Ties	[Prague CTK]	75
Landsbergis on Independence Declaration Suspension	[AFP]	75
Vilnius Radio Carries 29 May Supreme Council		75
Agenda Adopted		75
Agrarian Reform Debated		76
Debates Continue		76
Deputy Status Law Adopted		77
Landsbergis Sends Congratulations to Yeltsin	[Vilnius Radio]	77
Disputes at Lithuanian Supreme Council Reported	[Moscow Radio]	77
Vilnius Radio Protests Against Interference	[Vilnius International]	78
Lithuania's 'Critical' Power Situation Noted	[Moscow TV]	78
Lithuanian Commission Studies Fuel Shortages	[Vilnius Radio]	78
Vilnius Radio Outlines Unemployment Situation		78
Landsbergis Issues Appeals to Lithuanians	[Vilnius Radio]	79

Prunskiene Holds 28 May Press Conference [Vilnius Radio]	80
Lithuanians Polled on Independence, Compromise [Vilnius Radio]	80
Vilnius Rayon Soviet Urges Referendum [Moscow Radio]	81
Leningrad City Soviet Ignores Lithuanian Blockade [Vilnius Radio]	81
Urges Halt to Blockade [Vilnius International]	81
Moscow TV Views Differing Estonian Meetings	81
More on Congresses [IZVESTIYA 29 May]	81
Head of New Estonian Home Defense Appointed [Tallinn Radio]	82
Laanjärvi Interviewed [Tallinn TV]	82
Estonia's Lauristin Views Baltic 'Myths' [MOSCOW NEWS 20 May]	82
Gorbunov Views Meeting with Gorbachev [Riga International]	84
Latvians Cautioned Against Signing Petitions [Riga Radio]	84
Pro-Moscow Latvian Party Bureau Meets [Riga Radio]	84
Pro-Soviet Committee Formed in Latvia [Moscow Radio]	84
Latvian Chairman Views Need for 'Self-Control' [MOSCOW NEWS 20 May]	85
Farmers Movement Fund Set Up in Latvia [TASS]	86
Latvian Trade Unions Congress Opens [TASS]	87
Military School Chief on Admissions Program [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 May]	87
Latvian Popular Front Paper Changes Name [Riga Radio]	87
Baltic Declaration Views Gorbachev Authority [Vilnius International]	87
Stockholm Symposium Views Baltic Independence [IZVESTIYA 26 May]	87

RSFSR

Moscow TV Relays 29 May Congress Proceedings	89
Yeltsin Wins Election	89
Government Formation Debated	90
Yeltsin Interviewed on Election, Tasks [Moscow TV]	90
Views Relations With Gorbachev [Moscow International]	91
Views Sovereignty [Moscow TV]	92
Yeltsin Opens Conciliation Commission [Moscow Radio]	92
More on Commission [TASS]	92
3,000 Turn Out To Celebrate Yeltsin Victory [AFP]	93
TASS Outlines Yeltsin Biography	93
Congress Passes Resolution on Chernobyl [TASS]	94
RSFSR Deputy Premier Trubilin Retires [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 May]	94
Reportage on Moscow City Food Restrictions	94
Guidelines Detailed [Moscow TV]	94
Bars Sales to Non-Residents [AFP]	94
More on Food Sale Limits [Moscow Radio]	94
Kalinin Oblast Protests Moscow Purchasing Rules [Moscow Radio]	95
Correspondent Discusses Moscow Food Rationing [Moscow Radio]	95
RSFSR Democratic Party Sets Out Program [Moscow Radio]	96
More on Congress [Moscow Radio]	96
Russian Komsomol Congress Continues Work [TASS]	97
New Youth Group Formed [TASS]	97
Worker-Peasant Union Forms in RSFSR [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 23 May]	98
Commission Discusses Aral Sea Pollution Problems [Moscow TV]	98
Pollution Detected in Khotkovo Water Supply [Moscow TV]	99
Gorkiy Soviet To End Power Station Project [TASS]	99
Voronezh Voters Reject Nuclear Plant [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 May]	99
Kalinin Oblast First Secretary Retires [PRAVDA 29 May]	100
North Ossetians Demonstrate, Appeal to Gorbachev [Moscow TV]	100
Donetsk Oblast Elects Congress Delegates [Moscow TV]	100
Myakota Continues Poltava Oblast Post [Moscow Radio]	100
Fire Causes Closure of Vorkuta Mine [TASS]	101
Russian Separatism Movement Discussed [IZVESTIYA 27 May]	101

Western Republics

Ukraine Parliament 'Negative' on Price Hikes [Kiev International]	102
---	-----

Ivashko Opposes Moscow Price Hike Plans [Kiev International]	102
Deputies Assess Ivashko Speech [Kiev International]	103
Reportage on Belorussian Supreme Soviet	103
Resumes Work [Moscow TV]	103
Elects Officials [ZVYAZDA 20 May]	104
UN Envoy Elected [Minsk Radio]	104
Earthquake Shakes Moldavia, Buildings Damaged [TASS]	104

Caucasus

Prudence Urged in Wake of 27 May Incidents [Yerevan Radio]	104
Mourning Ceremonies Held in Yerevan [Yerevan International]	104
Report on 27 May Spitak Earth Tremor [ARMENPRES]	104
Armenia's Place in Renewed Federation Examined [Yerevan Radio]	105
Convoy Reportedly Stoned in Mardakartskiy Rayon [Baku Radio]	105
Report on Celebration of Azerbaijan Statehood [Moscow TV]	105
Azerbaijan Troops Send Appeal to Gorbachev [Moscow TV]	106
Elections to Armenian Supreme Soviet Held [TASS]	106
Airstrip at Mardakertskiy Rayon Closed [Baku Radio]	107

Shevardnadze on All-European Security Structure

*PM2905160890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 May 90 Morning Edition p 5*

[E. Shevardnadze article: "Europe: A Generation's Mission"]

[Text] The changes that have taken place in Europe are today posing politicians a question: What next?

For decades people used to talk about the dangers of confrontation between the two military-political alliances, the high price of the cold war for Europeans, the need to end the division of the continent, German unity, the progress of the Helsinki process, and the strengthening of security and cooperation.

Now all this appears in a different light, in different dimensions, and opens up formerly inconceivable prospects, but it also creates new problems.

That is why, amid the torrent of euphoric statements, assessments, and commentaries, doubts can be heard—as to whether we will find ourselves back on the old road leading to the rebirth of rivalry among nation states and a repetition of the mistakes that more than once led Europe to tragedy.

I do not think this will happen, provided that we do not forget the past and that we remember our obligation and duty to think and work to prevent hitches in our common progress and to make full use of the opportunities that history has given us.

I am confident that it will not happen, provided that politicians have sufficient ability to analyze the situation realistically and critically and to grasp the pressing need to reinterpret many familiar ideas on the foundations of European security and cooperation.

There must be no delay here, especially in light of the processes associated with the building of German unity.

The alternative, as M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his interview for TIME Magazine, has already become clear: It is the institutionalization of all-European development and the creation of totally new structures on an all-European basis, with, of course, the active participation of the United States and Canada.

It would be naive to suppose that in the new circumstances, the old political and organizational instruments will suffice. It will certainly be necessary to create a structure that will oppose the forces that are working to break up the still fragile European community [obshchestvo].

Fortunately we already have some elements of this structure. There is the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the associated accords, rules, procedures, and standards.

The Helsinki package of principles and agreements is a living, active political organism with enormous potential for evolutionary development.

Its main strength lies in the principle of consensus—not simply proclaimed consensus, but actual functioning consensus. During difficult periods the European countries have succeeded in finding mutually acceptable options in virtually all spheres of interstate relations.

Consensus is the only foundation on which it is possible to build collective—as we say, or cooperative, in the terminology of some of our partners—all-European security structures. Given this approach, nothing can be imposed and no one's interests will be flouted or disregarded.

The principle of common consent is not easy to adhere to—really new thinking is needed here, but then the outcome is a lasting, reliable decision that is strictly observed by all parties.

In the new conditions of the assertion of high standards of democracy, to conduct international affairs in any other way is impossible and will not work.

Why are all-European security structures needed? Because the bloc system was designed for a scenario of direct, face-to-face confrontation between the sides' armed forces—and confrontation at an ever higher qualitative level of means of mutual destruction.

Behind the talk about the blocs' defensive nature there has always been another reality—the orientation of their armed forces toward the conduct of offensive military operations.

The blocs sprang up as a consequence of the cold war. They cannot remain the same when the cold war has become a thing of the past. The Warsaw Pact was the first to react to this—both through large-scale unilateral reductions in troops and armaments in the member countries and through the transition to a defensive doctrine as a whole, as a bloc, and the building of its armed forces on the basis of the principles of nonoffensive defense and reasonable sufficiency.

This process is developing in the West too. Thus the communique of the NATO Military Planning Committee adopted on 23 May this year says:

"We have decided to undertake a review of NATO military strategy and bring our defensive tasks into line with the new, developing situation in future. We will have to adjust our concepts and operational doctrines."

The North Atlantic alliance has abandoned the goal of an annual three-percent increase in military spending and adopted measures to reduce the level of combat readiness of certain of its permanent forces. NATO has dropped the program for modernization of American tactical nuclear missiles in Europe and expressed readiness to enter into talks on the limitation and reduction of this type of weapon.

We will, of course, watch carefully how these intentions are realized in NATO's practical activity. But another objective necessity also arises: to take a fresh look to see whether the foundations exist today for establishing relations of partnership between the blocs. They cannot go on indefinitely confronting and standing up to each other!

In the new situation, the question of security guarantees for those European states that do not or will not belong to military blocs arises in a new way. Only new all-European security structures can give them such guarantees.

The real situation in Europe dictates the need to go over to the resolution of all aspects of the problem of security, disarmament, and confidence-building within the framework of forums of all 35 CSCE states.

A most important component of European security is the talks of the 23 and the 35 in Vienna. These talks cannot be conducted actively and productively without due attention being paid to them at political levels.

That is why political institutions of the all-European process should be created.

In our opinion, these should be:

—The Council (Assembly) of Greater Europe—a forum of the top leaders of all the CSCE member states. This would examine cardinal questions of European policy and formulate fundamental political principles and concrete decisions on a consensus basis.

Sessions of the Council (Assembly) would be held at least once every two years.

—The Committee (Council) of Foreign Ministers. It would prepare questions for examination at meetings of the top leaders and monitor the fulfillment of their decisions. The ministers would be responsible for leadership of other organs that might be created.

Obviously, between meetings of the top leaders and conferences of ministers, problems and situations could arise that would require examination at political levels.

Here it would help to set up "triumvirates" ["troyki"] (the former, current, and future chairmen) of the leaders and ministers, endowed with mandates of some kind for holding urgent consultations.

For day-to-day needs, it would be worth coming to an agreement on the operation of a consultative machinery consisting of envoys of the 35 countries in the capital where the CSCE's permanent secretariat will be, with the minimum necessary number of experts and technical staffers.

In our view, it is important to create a center for ensuring stability in the military-political sphere throughout Europe as the first module of the future new security structures. It could comprise two organs: The first would tackle questions concerning the collection and dissemination of data on states' military activity and would help

enhance its transparency. Its functions would also extend to questions of coordinating inspections, clarifying unclear or disputed situations, and preparing appropriate reports and recommendations for the foreign ministers' committee.

The second organ would concentrate on the task of solving crisis situations. It could dispatch good offices missions, mediate between sides, and assist in easing frictions and tension.

Of course, the activity of this center should fit in with the already existing Stockholm accords on confidence building and security measures and with other control and verification [kontrolnyye i verifikatsionnyye] procedures agreed at the Vienna talks.

We advocate the siting in Berlin of the center for prevention and solution of conflicts. This would be of considerable symbolic importance.

In our opinion, the question of establishing such a center could be agreed during preparations for the all-European summit meeting, with the meeting itself announcing the establishment of this organ.

It is well known that all participants in the future summit meeting have already agreed that it would discuss questions of the future Helsinki process in breadth.

It is obvious that the leaders of CSCE states will speak out firmly in support of the principles of democracy, free elections, political pluralism, and the multiparty system and will emphasize association and other aspects of the humanitarian and legal spheres.

We assume that the summit meeting at year's end will form a special group to prepare recommendations for coordinating the activity of already existing organizations dealing with the economy, the ecology, communications, and exchange of information and people.

Evidently, this will also require the creation of some new institutions; but the main point will be to make utmost use of the potential of the Council of Europe, the EC, the UN European Economic Commission, CEMA and its organs, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the OECD, the European Free Trade Association, the Nordic Council, and other European organizations and associations in the West and the East alike.

It is understandable that we will attach special importance to synchronizing and interlinking the institutionalization of the Helsinki process and the building of German unity.

The fundamental questions associated with the external aspects of German unity will be examined, as already agreed, within the framework of the "Two-Plus-Four" mechanism which has already been created especially for this purpose. It is already functioning and, as everyone agrees, it is not functioning badly. The results of its work

and the accords which have been reached will be submitted to the meeting of top leaders from all European states.

Of course, "the Six" still have to solve some very difficult questions, such as Germany's future military-political status. The Soviet leadership's views on this problem were recently outlined yet again by M.S. Gorbachev at the joint news conference by the presidents of the USSR and France in Moscow.

An option must be sought here which would be acceptable to all and would take into account the interests of Germany, the Soviet Union, and others.

I would like to say the following in this context: We do not think that this question ought to be approached exclusively from today's positions, the positions of current realities. The situation here will not remain static. Therefore, the final settlement formula ought to be geared more toward the future than toward the present, let alone the past.

The determining factors when we decide on our position will be: first, the dynamics of changes in NATO's concepts and strategic doctrines and the degree of this bloc's transformation into a political-military rather than a military-political alliance.

Second, the pace and depth of the all-European process of disarmament and, naturally, the Bundeswehr's military parameters.

Third, the speed and scale of the creation of all-European structures and institutions, primarily in the security sphere.

We would like to think that we will soon be able to obtain a clearer picture of what could be expected along these three avenues.

If the process of building German unity were to be organically and properly incorporated in the multifaceted European security context, a solution to what now appear to be its burdensome aspects could be found without detriment to anyone.

Only one aspect of the need to create all-European structures and institutions touches upon the problem of German unity.

An incalculably more significant goal of this large-scale enterprise concerns the future stability and predictability of the European situation and solves the task of preventing a new split and fragmentation of Europe.

All states are certainly interested in this, because peace, tranquillity, and mutually advantageous cooperation in a Europe marching along the path of integration and creation of single spaces—in security, the legal sphere, humanitarian cooperation, and economic and ecological collaboration—will ultimately depend on it.

I would like to say that the submission of the question of institutionalizing the all-European process and creating new security structures within its framework is widely supported.

A nucleus of practical proposals and conceptual approaches is already taking shape. It is gratifying that our proposals in this regard follow along the tracks of other countries' ideas, that there are many similar and close elements.

We welcomed with interest President F. Mitterrand's idea of a European confederation, U.S. President Bush's idea of an integral democratic Europe, Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher's idea of a new peace order in Europe, Foreign Minister M. Eyskens' idea of a European confederative community, Prime Minister T. Mazowiecki's idea of a European Cooperation Council, Foreign Minister J. Dienstbier's idea of a European Security Commission, and others. Despite all their nuances and differences, they are imbued with concern for Europe's peaceful future.

They are all in active political circulation.

We exchanged opinions on questions of all-European building with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker; with Foreign Ministers H.-D. Genscher of the FRG, R. Dumas of France, D. Hurd of Britain, and De Michelis of Italy; and with other colleagues.

Their response is positive and promising. We consulted at the working level with representatives of a number of other West and East European states and encountered understanding by them.

It must be said that other states' politicians have also expressed quite a few original ideas about ways to further develop and improve the Helsinki process. They contain valuable rational elements and promising notions.

It has been agreed that experts from all 35 CSCE states will begin consultations on all these questions in the first half of July.

Our delegation will actively and constructively work to find consensus.

I would like to end on the following idea: The United Nations Organization emerged after the end of World War II. The task of modern diplomacy is to draw a line beneath the cold war by laying firm foundations for the future all-European home.

Kulikov on United Germany in NATO, Warsaw Pact
LD2605092890 Hamburg DPA in German 0908 GMT
26 May 90

[Text] Hamburg (DPA)—In the view of the Soviet military leadership a united Germany must not store any type of weapon of mass destruction on its soil and should, moreover, temporarily belong to both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. This was stated by Soviet Marshal

Viktor Kulikov in the paper *BILD AM SONNTAG*. A united Germany must also unreservedly recognize the present borders in Europe.

As member of both military blocs, a future Germany could be a "sort of link between the East and West" on the path to new collective security structures in Europe. At the same time disarmament must continue in both blocs. The USSR is unilaterally reducing its armed forces by nearly 250,000 men in Europe by early 1991, said Kulikov, who is also a member of the Supreme Soviet.

An edited version of the interview was prereleased to DPA.

NATO Planning Committee Document Viewed

*PM2905130990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
25 May 90 Morning Edition p 5*

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent B. Moskvichev: "NATO: A Time of Changes?"]

[Text] Brussels—At first reading, the final communique of the NATO Military Planning Committee session which took place in Brussels is reminiscent more of a document prepared by politicians than by the military. And it is this subtle distinction that is particularly significant in the situation now taking shape in Europe. And that is why you can readily agree with the first sentence in the document, which says that the spring session of the committee marks the beginning of a new era.

Of course, we must not forget that it is not only the spring mood that is affecting the defense ministers of 14 countries belonging to NATO (not France and Iceland), but first and foremost an awareness of the consequences that have occurred in the USSR and East European countries, as well as the increasing pressure by politicians who realize that radical adjustments must be made to the activity of the North Atlantic alliance.

A kind of sensation was caused by the committee's statement on the need to revise NATO's military-strategic doctrine, since, in the opinion of the military, a sudden attack should not be expected from the Warsaw Pact, although a certain risk, or a possibility of confrontation between blocs, remains.

Also testifying to the political orientation of the adopted document is the fact that of its 11 points, only a few concern purely military problems. Bearing in mind the new conditions that have taken shape in Europe, the defense ministers have declared that it is necessary to try to reduce the level of combat readiness of some subunits on alert duty. It is planned that the number of military exercises and the combat training programs will be reduced.

A proposal on the creation of multinational forces was put forward; although, according to certain observers, this provision is primarily aimed at justifying the maintenance of a presence of U.S. subdivisions "on the old

continent." It is evidently to these very ends that the participants in the Brussels meeting are stressing that despite the reduction in Soviet armed forces that has taken place, they are still sufficiently well equipped as regards both nuclear forces and conventional weapons.

The defense ministers devoted a great deal of attention to questions of preserving security. Remaining loyal to the existing mechanism for ensuring security based on the NATO structure, they nevertheless advocated the possible use of the Helsinki accords also in this respect.

The communique gave great significance to the successful conclusion of the Vienna talks and to the situation that will develop in Europe under the influence of the agreements reached at those talks.

Gerasimov Briefing on Jewish Settlement Issues

*LD2905215590 Kuwait KUNA in English 2003 GMT
29 May 90*

[Text] United Nations, May 29 (KUNA)—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov Tuesday [29 May] held out the possibility of a joint U.S.-Soviet statement on the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories.

Responding to a question by KUNA, Gerasimov said there is agreement on both sides that it is "unwise and unlawful" for Israel to allow Soviet Jews to settle in the occupied territories.

"Here we have one position and speak with one voice," Gerasimov told a news conference. He is part of an advance team for the Bush-Gorbachev summit to begin later this week.

Gerasimov said a joint statement would be called for, although he said he doesn't know if the United States is prepared for it.

"A statement on this issue is quite possible, because my government has no objection to, together with the United States, putting pressure on Israel, but I don't know about their position," he said.

He said Moscow would appreciate "additional help from the United States" to push the Israeli Government into accepting these limitations on immigration.

Following the news conference, Gerasimov told reporters the Soviet Union cannot stop Jewish emigration, since this would contradict proposed law granting Jews free exit, and issuing Soviet passports to them.

The law is expected to be adopted "between September and November" of this year, according to Yuriy Golik, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Law Enforcement who participated in the team.

Gerasimov said, however, prior to issuing passports Israel must give guarantees that Jewish immigrants in Palestine will not settle in the occupied territories.

United States & Canada

Gorbachev Makes Pre-Summit Visit to Canada

Canadians Anticipate Visit

LD2805123590 Moscow TASS in English 1221 GMT
28 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets]

[Text] Ottawa May 28 TASS—The agenda of President Mikhail Gorbachev's state visit to Canada, beginning on May 29, includes meetings with Canadian leaders. The sides are expected to analyse the state of bilateral relations and seek new ways to resolve key international problems and areas of future cooperation.

More than 600 journalists have arrived in Ottawa to cover the visit. Canadian Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here that it was important to promote the Soviet-Canadian dialogue in the contemporary world.

Analysts note that, in Canada's opinion, the role of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation should be revised, since the cold war has ended and its participation in the all-European process should be regarded in a new light.

The Foreign Ministry reassessed its stand on questions of European policy and advanced proposals to enhance the role of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Canadian ideas to set up a permanent conference body, which could galvanise the process of building an all-European home, are very noteworthy.

As member of the North Atlantic alliance, Canada is increasingly siding with countries that believe NATO should be "politicised" more quickly and emphasise its political, not military aspects.

Ottawa is becoming an active diplomatic force in Central America and in South Africa. Traditionally Canada plays a leading role in U.N. peace-keeping forces.

Business relations assume a particularly important role. Economic cooperation is making headway, though not without difficulty. Canadian Minister for Foreign Trade John Crosbie told TASS that annual trade between the two countries now equalled about one billion U.S. dollars. He said this was only the beginning and that Canada was fully resolved to expand the volume of trade and investment.

Crosbie believes this is already happening. Several dozen joint ventures have been launched. Some experts believe Canadian investment in the USSR could reach one billion dollars within the next few years.

Crosbie said that the Soviet president's visit could strengthen friendly relations between the two governments and peoples. He stressed that it would allow the two sides to discuss a wide range of economic and other

problems, undoubtedly arousing further Canadian interest in the search for ways to expand trade and investment in the USSR.

Preparations, Mood in Ottawa Noted

PM2905155190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 May 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Dispatch by special correspondent A. Shalnev: "Twenty-Nine Brief Hours"]

[Text] Ottawa—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev will spend just 29 hours in Canada. Despite the brevity of the visit, Canadians are awaiting with considerable interest their meetings with the Soviet leader, who has already visited here once before—in 1983.

The preparations do not just amount to giving a new coat of paint, as is the case in Moscow, to the wooden billboards along one of the streets where the motorcade will pass, or soldering down the manhole covers on the main thoroughfares so as to rule out the possibility of a terrorist attack. The preparations do not just amount to the collectors' badges depicting the Canadian and Soviet flags, or the beautiful glossy booklets on the visit supplied to the Canadian and foreign press. Nor do they merely amount to questions confirming how great Canadians' interest is in what is currently happening in our country and how high the USSR president's popularity is among them.

Canadians are in a serious mood and intend to make the utmost use of the visit for productive discussions. I am almost sure that the speech delivered by Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs Joseph Clark the other day was aimed precisely at the high-level visit.

In his speech the secretary of state for external affairs talked about what would inevitably be an element on the agenda of the Soviet-Canadian summit and, a day later, of the Soviet-U.S. summit. He was talking about the future of Europe, advocating, in particular, a substantial revision of NATO's role to give that organization increasingly political functions; he talked of how little sense there is in retaining an alliance in Europe of the "largest peacetime armed forces in human history."

The minister particularly emphasized the fact that safeguarding "security should be a matter for cooperation rather than competition," and in this respect put forward what seemed, to me, the curious proposal that regular meetings be organized between the Soviet foreign minister and the NATO foreign ministers. Between one man and 15.

Joseph Clark's speech also vigorously voiced the idea of stepping up and reinforcing the role of the CSCE. Again there were specific proposals: Conferences should be convened at foreign minister level once a year, and at top leader level once every two years. These meetings, the head of the Canadian foreign policy department noted, could be the source of the creation of a "European

cooperation council, that is, a standing forum for dialogue on pan-European issues."

That is one set of topics.

I entirely admit that the meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and Canadian Premier Brian Mulroney will, one way or another, touch on questions which essentially relate to each side's domestic affairs, but which attract international attention. I mean the situation in our union republics—particularly the Baltic—and the situation which has emerged recently around Canada's Quebec Province and could, certain commentators predict, threaten the breakup of Canada. According to a report in THE GLOBE AND MAIL newspaper, Secretary of State for External Affairs J. Clark denied that the "question of Lithuanian independence will be examined at the summit. Recognition of Lithuanian independence by a country such as Canada," the minister stressed, "would clearly be counterproductive."

But it is hard to imagine how the Soviet and Canadian leaders will be able to avoid the subject, if only because, judging by local press reports, emigres from the Baltics, the Ukraine, and Belorussia are preparing a series of protests timed to coincide with M.S. Gorbachev's visit.

And then, in my view, discussion of these issues could even be useful for both sides: Canada's intercommunity experience undoubtedly has things to teach us—one in 10 Canadians has East European roots, incidentally.

There is one other topic which may not be part of the official agenda for the Ottawa meeting but which cannot be ruled out of the discussion. This is the subject of nuclear testing in the Arctic. As is well known, we will soon be stopping our underground nuclear tests in Kazakhstan, but we will be transferring them to Novaya Zemlya, where, according to the Canadians, 36 underground explosions have been staged since 1963—that is, since the conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. Our plans are causing considerable concern here—in particular, regarding the potential ecological consequences for the Arctic. But, as THE GLOBE AND MAIL recalls, "environmental protection was one of the provisions of the accord signed in Moscow last November during B. Mulroney's visit to the USSR."

Twenty-nine hours is indeed a very short time. But the mass of issues to be discussed, within the framework of the official agenda or not, shows that the importance of the coming visit should by no means be measured by its duration.

Itinerary in Canada, U.S. Reported

*LD2905190890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1703 GMT 29 May 90*

[Text] The state visit to Canada by Soviet President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev began today. He is being accompanied by members of the USSR Presidential Council, Comrades Shevardnadze, Maslyukov, Primakov, Osipyan, and Shatalin, on this trip. The Soviet head of state's itinerary in Ottawa today envisions an unofficial breakfast in a small group. The wife of Comrade Gorbachev and the wife of Brian Mulroney, Canadian prime minister, will take part in it.

In the second half of the day—comrades, take into account the 8-hour time difference—a visit by the USSR president and his wife to the governor-general of Canada has been planned. Official negotiations between the USSR and Canada begin Wednesday. An official breakfast in honor of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his wife will be held by Brian Mulroney and his wife afterwards. The Soviet delegation is flying to Washington tomorrow afternoon. The negotiations between USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush should start on 31 May. The visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has again attracted the attention of the whole world to the U.S. capital. That is fair enough. After all, questions of vital importance for all the inhabitants of the planet will be discussed at the negotiations between the leaders of two countries.

Gorbachev Meets Governor-General

*LD3005054190 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0505 GMT 30 May 90*

[Text] Ottawa, 30 May (TASS)—A conversation has taken place between M.S. Gorbachev and Canadian Governor-General R. Hnatyshyn.

The two parties highly assessed Soviet-Canadian cooperation, including cooperation in the European process and at the United Nations. They expressed confidence in its successful development and in the future which is particularly important in the present international situation. They spoke about possible opportunities for cooperation; both sides have immense resources and rare information on nature at their disposal. They expressed approval at the arrangement of relations between Soviet Kazakhstan and the Province of Saskatchewan.

The governor-general informed the USSR president about the assistance which the Canadian people, especially the descendants of emigres from the Ukraine, are rendering to those who suffered in the Chernobyl disaster. He also spoke of intentions to increase this assistance.

Expressing the mood of all the Canadian people, the Canadian governor-general wished Soviet people success in the implementation of the ideas of perestroika.

First Day of Visit Reported

LD3005041190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0240 GMT 30 May 90

[Correspondent Yevgeniy Grachev report from Ottawa]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The Canadian side has organized the visit in such a way that matters of protocol and serious talks alternate with elements of purely personal contact. Among these, for example, was a brief stroll around the city. The president and his wife passed through the so-called market area and the town's pedestrian precinct. I say so-called because this is not a market as we understand it, but narrow streets with a huge number of small shops selling flowers, fruit, and vegetables. Well, what a pedestrian precinct is we all know. For example, Moscovites will know what I am talking about right away if I say this reminds one of the New Arbat.

Strictly speaking, the first day of the USSR president's visit ended at that point. The main meetings and conversations will be held today. More about this a little later because within the framework of the visit a lot of work is being done by the official delegations.

Yesterday, a whole series of meetings and conversations were held between those taking part in the talks. I will recall that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is being accompanied in his visit by Comrades Shevardnadze, Maslyukov, Primakov, Osipyan, and Shatalin, as well as by experts.

USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze met with Clark, his Canadian colleague and partner. It is understood that questions of bilateral relations and numerous international problems were discussed. Another meeting was held yesterday in which members of the Presidential Council—Comrades Maslyukov, Primakov, Shatalin, and Osipyan—from the Soviet side, and from the Canadian side representatives of business circles and those interested in the dynamic development of economic cooperation between our sides took part. These talks will continue today in extended form with the participation of the USSR president and the Canadian prime minister.

As we are now about to speak of today's agenda, something of what is in store. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva, and other members of the delegation will visit the National Military memorial on Parliament Hill. A wreath-laying ceremony will take place there. Then the president and the officials accompanying him will set off for talks in the parliament building. During that time, Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva, accompanied by the Canadian premier's wife, Mila Mulroney, will familiarize herself with a tour of Ottawa and visit the Natural Civilization Museum, and then, later, Mikhail Sergeyevich and Raisa Maksimovna will visit the National Gallery. Then, in the

middle of the day, at approximately 1400 local time there will be an official luncheon on behalf of Canadian Prime Minister and Mila Mulroney in honor of the USSR president and Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva. The president and the Canadian prime minister will make speeches.

In the second half of the day, the agenda of the visit will be concluded. Following the official departure ceremony, the Soviet delegation will fly to Washington.

Shevardnadze, Clark Discuss Issues

LD3005075590 Moscow TASS in English 0748 GMT
30 May 90

[Text] Ottawa May 30 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze had two rounds of talks with his Canadian counterpart Joseph Clark in Ottawa on Tuesday, in the framework of President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Canada.

The two talked in detail about international issues, paying special attention to the situation in Europe.

Shevardnadze and Clark agreed that a united Germany should be a factor of peace and stability in Europe.

They said they will seek to speed up Vienna talks on conventional arms reductions in Europe and hasten preparations for a successful CSCE-member-countries summit.

They also discussed a settlement in the Middle East and the situation in Central America and southern Africa.

They talked in detail about Soviet-Canadian cooperation, stressing that last November's Moscow meeting between the Soviet and Canadian leaders enlivened bilateral contacts considerably.

The ministers pledged to give political support to all mutually beneficial start-ups in this sphere—the development of trade and economic exchanges, the setting up of joint ventures, and deeper cooperation in health-care, tourism and other spheres.

Special attention was paid to discussing Soviet-Canadian cooperation in the Arctic.

Shevardnadze told Clark about reforms and developments in the Soviet Union, including about the Soviet leadership's determination to seek a political settlement in Lithuania within the framework and on the basis of the current Soviet Constitution.

The two said they will continue to exchange messages on issues of mutual interest.

They expressed hope that Gorbachev's visit to Canada and personal contacts between the leaders of the two countries will give a new impulse to Soviet-Canadian relations and open new vistas for bilateral cooperation in various spheres.

Shevardnadze informed Clark about the agenda of the forthcoming Soviet-American summit in Washington, saying special emphasis will be put on disarmament issues. Clark wished the summit success.

The Soviet side reiterated an earlier invitation to Clark to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union this year.

The Canadian minister said he plans to take up the invitation in the near future.

The talks were held in a constructive and benevolent atmosphere. Both sides pledged to seek mutually-acceptable solutions to all problems.

PRAVDA's Frolov Receives Canadian Editor

*PM2205110690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 May 90 Second Edition p 6*

["Own information" report: "Guest of the Editorial Office"]

[Text] Yesterday I.T. Frolov, PRAVDA chief editor and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received at his request J.A. Honderich, editor of Canada's TORONTO STAR newspaper, who is in Moscow. During the conversation problems of the development of glasnost and pluralism in the mass media and questions of cooperation between the two countries' publications were discussed.

Gerasimov Holds UN News Conference on Summit

*LD3005063490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1525 GMT 30 May 90*

[Text] United Nations, 30 May (TASS)—A news conference held at the UN Headquarters in New York on Tuesday was devoted to Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to the United States. It was conducted by Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate.

Soviet-U.S. relations are exerting an important influence on the international situation as a whole, Gerasimov pointed out. There will not be any kind of prescribed agenda for the forthcoming meeting. Regional conflicts may be discussed and there will be an exchange of opinions about what needs to be done to strengthen security in the world, and in particular, European security. In this connection, the question of German unification undoubtedly will come in for detailed examination, he said.

Replying to a question about the possibility of signing a Soviet-American trade agreement during the course of the summit meeting, Gerasimov noted that Soviet-U.S. trade is of definite significance to the Soviet Union, but it is not a question of particular importance. Some of the Soviet Union's most important trade partners are in Europe. First and foremost, these are the FRG and the GDR. When they are unified, Germany undoubtedly will be the USSR's most important trade partner. Of

course, the Soviet Union would like to improve trade relations with the United States.

U.S. business also is interested in this, but in the United States they keep on linking the question of trade with other problems. There is no problem with the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union. Moreover, the United States currently is not permitting all of them to enter their own country.

However, at the present moment in the United States they are linking the question of trade with the law on emigration, which still has not been adopted in the USSR Supreme Soviet. Unfortunately, there still is another linkage with the situation in the Baltic region, and particularly in Lithuania. Of course, if they do not wish to trade, one could put forward many different kinds of linkage, Gerasimov noted. This is an obstacle on the path to signing an already prepared trade agreement during the course of the forthcoming summit meeting, he stressed.

PRAVDA Sets U.S. Scene for Upcoming Summit

*PM2905185990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 May 90 First Edition p 7*

[Dispatch by PRAVDA special correspondents V. Gan, T. Kolesnichenko, V. Linnik, and V. Sukhoy: "A Time of Great Expectations"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 29 May—Yes, the world no longer dies of amazement at the announcement of the next U.S.-Soviet summit meeting, and talks between the leaders of the USSR and the United States are regarded today as a natural and necessary event in relations between our two countries. "The superpowers have entered an era," THE NEW YORK TIMES observed the other day, "when talks between us are increasingly becoming talks about spheres of cooperation rather than of confrontation." Indeed, the reality is different now. It is constantly changing because the world is changing and we are changing in this world.

Today constitutes a period in Soviet-U.S. relations where acute, deep-rooted questions are being generated more quickly than detailed answers to them. Maintaining the dynamics of Soviet-U.S. relations is somewhat reminiscent of riding a bicycle: You can only stop falling and maintain forward movement by pedaling constantly. And every pothole en route which our "tandem" runs into summons forth an avalanche of commentaries from right, left, and center. In this situation it is very important to maintain your forward momentum.

U.S. Senator Bill Bradley contends that the United States "cannot be a country with small ambitions." Yes, it is true. A large ship needs deep waters, as the saying goes. But how, given this, are you to begin thinking and acting in a new way if for decades Washington has essentially known only two forms of diplomacy— isolationism and a policy pursued from a position of

superior strength? Neither, as can be seen, is acceptable in today's world. [passage omitted].

The meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, Britain's *THE GUARDIAN* wrote recently, is a very important event. But not because the Soviet Union and the United States assign themselves the role of "arbiters of people's fate" on our planet, not because the two powers still possess huge stockpiles of destructive nuclear missiles, and not even because there are problems in today's world which cannot be solved without the active participation of the USSR and the United States. The matter is quite different: The world stands on the verge of solving many knotty issues, and the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is capable of spurring on this process, mapping out new routes, and opening up new horizons.

The military arsenals which our two powers possess are truly enormous. They are enough to destroy each other at least 10 times over! All this imposes an enormous burden of responsibility on the groups of experts who are putting the final touches to the basic provisions of the Soviet-U.S. documents.

Changes in the public mood in the two countries are striking. The danger of military confrontation is virtually absent now from people's minds. And although the two countries' nuclear missile arsenals have to date been cut by only three to five percent—a paltry figure in terms of the threat stemming from the weapons still retained—in people's minds on both sides of the ocean the risk of a military clash between the USSR and the United States has decreased immensely. So that there is no direct relationship between the real and the perceived reduction in threat, for the vector—the direction of movement—plays an enormous role in the perception.

Most Americans, according to poll data, consider the "cold war" over. The notorious "Soviet threat" which for decades dominated the thinking of the inhabitants of the New World now figures only ... No. 15 on the list of the most pressing issues with which America has to contend. Clearly not everything in such a breakthrough can be put down to us. Some events which helped this—for example, the changes in East Europe—occurred instead without our direct participation [pomimo nashey voli].

But that does not mean that problems of Soviet-U.S. relations cease to be basic to Americans. Inhabitants of the State of Massachusetts belonging to the organization "Americans Talk About Security" advance arguments in favor of our cooperation. "The overwhelming majority of us," they write in a letter addressed to M.S. Gorbachev and George Bush sent to the PRAVDA correspondents' center on the eve of the visit, "want to cooperate with the Soviet Union in combating such threats to national security as the international narcotics trade and the spread of nuclear missiles to Third World countries. We also want to cooperate with you within the framework of other Soviet-U.S. projects—for example,

in the spheres of environmental protection and space research." Although nuclear weapons have played an important role in averting a world war, the letter's authors go on to say, they resolutely support the idea of substantial nuclear arms cuts through balanced and verifiable agreements of the strategic offensive arms type.

Yes, there is currently no shortage of instructions for the two countries' leaders regarding the upcoming summit meeting. And, yes, one can understand both the Russians and Americans. People are not interested in the meeting as such. They are hoping tangible progress will be made and expect real actions and significant agreements which will alleviate their lives today. In discussion in the press of the crisis in their education system, the decline of the cities, rampant drug addiction, and the dilapidated state of the roads, Americans are aware of how important the so-called "peace dividend" is to the solution of all these problems. And it can only come as a result of cuts in the military budget. There is no need to talk about the acuteness of our own economic and social problems...

We asked a number of Americans to share their thoughts on the imminent meeting. This is the question we put to them: "What, in your opinion, is the most important feature of this 'summit' between the two presidents?" [passage omitted containing answers by academics, foreign policy expert, and newspaper editor]

It should be said that the U.S. media are trying to portray the agreement on the reduction of the two powers' strategic arsenals as something that is not of fundamental significance. It was suggested in a CBS news program that the proposed accord apparently does not affect the two states' nuclear missile modernization programs. The qualitative improvement of the lethal weapons is in full swing both in the USSR and in the United States, the television commentator remarked in this connection, which means their accuracy, range, and invulnerability are being increased. There are no particular grounds for euphoria.

As a matter of fact, no one is thinking of indulging in euphoria; but for the sake of the truth it should be said that it is the first time such radical weapons reductions have been discussed in the nuclear era. After all, two years ago we were welcoming the destruction of medium-range missiles in Europe as an enormous step forward in creating a safer world. Does this interpretation not illustrate how far our two countries have progressed in the disarmament agenda? What seemed unattainable only yesterday is now seen as routine.

...Someone said that the U.S. capital is always the same, that it is transformed only at "cherry blossom" time. Perhaps that is so. But it seems to us that Washington is somewhat different now. Everywhere you can see signs of the upcoming event. Traders are busy selling T-shirts bearing symbols of the U.S.-Soviet summit. *THE WASHINGTON POST* has issued special inserts on the meeting between the two presidents. Car fenders bear

humorous inscriptions relating to the current "hot" topic. On television's Channel 14 there are direct relays from Moscow.

Not long before this report was sent we watched the Moscow music and news program "120 Minutes" on television. It was early morning in Moscow and past midnight in Washington: a difference of eight hours.

After watching the Moscow news we switched to another channel. It was a motorcycle road race. The riders were bunched together for a long time. Then two broke away from the pack, leaving the others behind them. After all, someone has to be ahead....

The window was open. The air was warm and gentle. Nighttime Washington was saying goodbye to spring...

Hope, Expectations for Upcoming Summit Expressed

Bush Kennebunkport Remarks Quoted

PM2905140090 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 30 May 90 p 3

[TASS report: "'Chance of Lasting Peace'"]

[Text] Washington, 29 May—"I am practically ready for this week's meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, and I am waiting impatiently for this event," U.S. President George Bush stated. Answering journalists' questions on his family estate at Kennebunkport (Maine), where the White House chief spent Memorial Day, G. Bush announced that he is finishing work on reference material prepared by his experts, and will then spend two days holding "intensive and full consultations" with his closest aides on questions relating to the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting. On Thursday 31 May, the President added, I will be glad to greet President Gorbachev at the welcoming ceremony in the White House.

"We have an extensive agenda for the talks," G. Bush stressed, noting that he intends to discuss with the Soviet leader such key problems as arms control, the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments, the banning of chemical weapons, the unification of Germany, trade agreements, and the situation relating to the Baltic republics.

G. Bush noted in conclusion that M.S. Gorbachev faces "enormous problems" inside the country in connection with interethnic disturbances and economic difficulties. But "my personal opinion is that his position is extremely strong," he stated.

Later, at a Memorial Day ceremony in Kennebunkport, the President stressed in conversation with journalists: "There is no doubt that we now have a far better chance of lasting peace, but certain serious problems still exist. Our country must remain strong, we must continue to adhere to the principles that have made us a great country throughout our 200 years of history."

"I am going to the meeting to welcome with open arms the president of the Soviet Union," G. Bush stated. "But we must adhere firmly to our principles when we discuss the problems of universal peace. We must adhere to our principles when we discuss the problems of stability in Europe, and also the future of countries in various regions of the world which are not yet free. That is how I intend to act."

Bush Interview Comments Detailed

PM2705132190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Difficult Questions on Agenda. G. Bush's Remarks"]

[Text] Washington, 25 May—U.S. President George Bush gave a press conference at the White House Thursday during which he paid much attention to the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit. "We have a lot to discuss," he said, expressing the hope that the talks with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev will produce progress in a number of spheres.

The head of the U.S. Administration stressed that the United States and the USSR are "very close" to an agreement on chemical weapons, and he noted the possibility of advancing the talks on conventional arms. Nor did he rule out the possibility of "substantial progress" on strategic offensive arms, although, he said, the treaty will not be ready at the time of the meeting in Washington.

"I am guided by a desire to ensure progress along the path of the final elaboration of agreements....," G. Bush has said. "And it is very heartening that the administration is taking a united stance." We are about to discuss a wide range of very complex problems, the President stressed, "and I cannot foretell whether solutions to them will be found." As an example he cited "the very difficult question of the unification of Germany."

In an interview with ZDF, the West German television network, G. Bush stated: "I will do everything possible to ensure progress in the quest for arms control accords and a relaxation of regional tension and in the quest for an agreement with the Soviet Union on questions connected with the unification of Germany and the situation in Europe at the conclusion of this process." At the same time the President confirmed that Washington insists on the inclusion of the unified Germany in NATO and the continued stationing of U.S. troops on German territory.

In another television interview, with the BBC in London, G. Bush declared: I see in Mr. Gorbachev a man during whose term in office dramatic changes have taken place in Eastern Europe for the benefit of freedom and all mankind. I give him his due also for his efforts in the sphere of perestroika, reforms, and glasnost inside the USSR. I am convinced that most Western leaders see Gorbachev as a man with whom it is possible to speak frankly, with whom we share many principles.

He is a man, the U.S. President went on, who is faced with a mass of problems inside the country, above all economic problems, a man who is trying to work with us constructively in many spheres. Therefore we approach this summit with great openness.

Bush News Conference Remarks Noted

*PM2605174590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 May 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Blinov: "G. Bush: 'Upcoming Talks Will Be Substantive'"]

[Text] Washington—The upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit promises progress on a whole range of international problems, even if there are not officially signed agreements. This appraisal was made by U.S. President G. Bush at a White House press conference last Thursday.

The U.S. President stressed that he is counting on "substantive talks" with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev on issues such as the conclusion of the treaty on strategic offensive arms reductions between the USSR and the United States, steps to ensure success at the multilateral talks on the reduction of conventional forces in Europe, the banning of chemical arms, and the "extremely complex problem of the reunification of Germany."

The head of the U.S. Administration denied claims which have appeared in the U.S. press of late alleging that he is dissatisfied with the results of Secretary of State J. Baker's talks in Moscow on the problem of offensive strategic arms. "There are no differences between us," G. Bush declared. "The administration's position is united and firm."

"The administration is unanimous," G. Bush stated. "I am confident that we are on the right road."

The journalists attending the White House news conference were especially interested in the climate of Soviet-American relations on the eve of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's state visit to the United States. "I do not want our ships to pass in the night," G. Bush declared. "There is much we must discuss." The President repeated his well-known remark that the "enemy is instability and unpredictability."

At the upcoming talks the U.S. side will also raise questions which are the subject of differences. According to G. Bush, they include "the problem of Lithuania and the Baltic republics as a whole, which has caused certain friction."

The U.S. President said for the first time that an announcement on granting the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status will not be made during the upcoming summit. "In the given situation," he said, "we will not cross this bridge. The political climate in the country makes this extremely difficult." The main reason is that the law on emigration, which is the main condition for a change in the U.S. Administration's

approach to the question of bilateral trade relations, will not be adopted in the Soviet Union before the beginning of the summit.

More Pre-Summit Comments by Bush

*PM2705120190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 May 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "G. Bush: Need To Conduct Businesslike Talks"]

[Text] Washington, 26 May—President G. Bush declared here Friday [25 May] that he is prepared for talks in a businesslike spirit with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev on all aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations during the latter's visit to the United States.

"Gorbachev is a strong Soviet leader who stands on firm positions, and we need to conduct businesslike talks with him," G. Bush declared in an interview with French journalists. "This also applies to problems on which we differ like, for example, the Lithuanian question. We can find a way out in the solution of a series of problems. They include arms control questions and some more complex problems like Europe's future following Germany's unification."

The President declared that he will discuss the problem of Germany's unification with the Soviet leader and will set out the U.S. position. He again spoke in favor of united Germany remaining within NATO, declaring that this will not "pose a threat to the USSR" but, on the contrary, will promote the ensuring of stability in Europe.

The U.S. President will spend his last break before the meeting in the company of eminent sovietologists and close members of his cabinet in his native town of Kennebunkport (Maine) on the Atlantic coast. In a brief statement to journalists prior to flying out there Friday, Bush again expressed hope that the U.S.-Soviet talks would make it possible to achieve "significant progress on questions like reduction of long-range nuclear arms and would conclude with the signing of an agreement banning chemical weapons." "Gorbachev is a man with whom we can conduct debates in a frank fashion," the head of the administration emphasized.

Prospects of Summit Viewed

*PM2905221790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 30 May 90 First Edition p 3*

[Telephoned dispatch by own special correspondent Captain First Rank V. Kuzar: "First Meeting Since the 'Cold War'"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 28 May—Washington again. Two and one-half years have elapsed since the Soviet-U.S. summit took place here. No time at all by historical yardsticks. But in terms of its significance for the destiny of mankind it is equivalent to a whole epoch. And this is far from an exaggeration, for the changes which have

taken place not just in Soviet-U.S. relations but also in the way of life of the whole planet can be described as precisely epochmaking. And the main one, in my view, is the end of the "cold war," which was announced on Malta.

Today's meeting of the Soviet and American presidents will be the first since the "cold war." The world public is counting on it reaching decisions capable of strengthening international security on the broadest panhuman basis and concentrating joint efforts on the global problems of mankind. [passage omitted]

And yet what are the prospects for today's summit? Judging by reports in the U.S. mass media, assessments of them are contradictory, particularly in respect of the main problem of the talks—strategic offensive arms cuts. It is still not clear yet what kind of agreement it will be. Diplomats and military experts are continuing their painstaking work on them. But what is disturbing is that newspapers and magazines here are already engaged in arguing over who will win and who will lose by this agreement, whose concessions will be the greater, and whose position the stronger. I would like to hope that common sense will win and that an agreement will ultimately be concluded that leads to a significant reduction in the Soviet and American nuclear arsenals.

Prospects for a chemical weapons agreement are more favorable. It is expected that the meeting will see the signing of a document under which the USSR and the United States will immediately embark on an 80-percent reduction in their chemical weapons stockpiles. On the eve of the meeting President Bush signed a bill under which private individuals who are citizens of the United States will be subject to legal prosecution for the development of chemical and bacteriological weapons at enterprises and in laboratories belonging to them. Henceforth help given by individual Americans to foreign states to develop or acquire means of waging bacteriological warfare will be considered a criminal offense. The law does not apply such bans to state enterprises or laboratories, where research work in this sphere may be conducted.

Problems concerning conventional arms cuts and the limitation of nuclear tests, the future of Germany and the European Continent as a whole, and regional conflicts also figure among questions for the Soviet-U.S. meeting. A considerable part of the time at the talks will also be occupied by questions of bilateral relations in the sphere of science, culture, and commercial and economic ties. Much has already been achieved here and much is being done to expand mutually beneficial cooperation. But there are also outstanding problems.

In particular there are the well-known obstacles to normalizing Soviet-U.S. trade. Their removal, as a number of senators have stated even today, depends on the development of the situation in the Baltic. The formulation of the question in this way clearly shows the desire of certain American circles to interfere in the Soviet

Union's internal affairs, which clearly runs counter to the spirit of the times. This has also been noted by former ambassador to the USSR John [as published] Kennan. Concerning the situation in Lithuania, he said that "it would be very foolish for U.S. policy to bank on the collapse of the Soviet Union and offer our support to any group which wishes to separate itself from the Soviet state." In Kennan's opinion, "any such political course could mean finding ourselves in very strange and unpleasant company," and interference in the Soviet Union's affairs is scarcely capable of bringing a positive result.

One is bound to agree with that. The Soviet-U.S. dialogue has already built up much that is positive and from which both sides benefit. And it is essential to make the maximum use of the new summit meeting for the benefit of our peoples and the benefit of all mankind. I would like to hope that this will be decisive in the Soviet-U.S. summit talks which start in the Oval Office 31 May.

'Agreements' Expected at Summit

LD2905203490 Moscow TASS in English 2002 GMT
29 May 90

[Text] Washington May 29 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

The growing dynamics of international developments call for the urgent intensification of a Soviet-American dialogue, which has already become an important element of world politics. This process is to be promoted by the forthcoming Soviet-American summit, which is expected to mark the beginning of a new era in Soviet-American relations.

It is obvious that priority in the agenda has been given to disarmament problems. Americans hope that the summit will work out extremely important agreements on strategic offensive and conventional weapons. It is also expected here that it will be a major step forward in banning nuclear tests, strengthening confidence and developing cooperation in many spheres of the two countries' relations. Considerable progress has already been achieved on the way to the banning and destruction of chemical weapons. Protocols to treaties on nuclear explosions have been prepared for signing.

An impressive package of agreements on bilateral relations is also expected to be signed. They include a dozen of new intergovernmental agreements and other bilateral agreements dealing with economic cooperation, thermo-nuclear synthesis, investment guarantees, taxes, the gradual reduction of a list of closed zones and so on. An opportunity is opening up before the Soviet and American presidents to continue a dialogue on global aspects of the environmental protection, space exploration and its peaceful use, a peaceful use of nuclear energy, the struggle against international terrorism, the prevention of illegal drug trafficking and joint promotion of greater efficiency of the United Nations Organisation. The recent talks with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in

Moscow showed that in these spheres of Soviet-American cooperation tangible results can also be achieved at the summit.

Americans hope that additional ways will be found at the summit to promote jointly the solution of regional problems which include a wide range of conflict situations, for example, the situation in the Middle East, Central America, the South of Africa, the African Horn and the Korean peninsula, the Cambodia settlement and the termination of bloodshed in Afghanistan.

Many American observers believe that agreements reached in this sphere show that both sides have advanced far enough in the solution of a number of key bilateral and international problems. This does not mean, however, that the two presidents will not work hard in Washington. Much remains to be done for them to be able to come up with a statement on coordinating the main provisions of a treaty on radical reductions of strategic offensive armaments. Experts and specialist meeting these days in Washington are working on these details.

It is believed here that the needed dynamics have not been reached so far at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces. The talks urgently need additional stimuli. The Soviet side believes that the basis of the future agreement is ready, on the whole. It is based on the agreements concerning six categories of conventional armed forces which are subject to reduction. These include the personnel, planes, helicopters, tanks, armoured vehicles and artillery. The problem of the air force [as received] and the reduction of the Soviet and American personnel deployed outside their national territories in Europe still remain to be settled.

Economic 'Miracle' Not Expected

PM2905104990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent V. Linnik: "Toward the Summit Meeting. USSR and United States: Economic Aspect"]

[Text] New York—"The political atmosphere in our relations has improved considerably," I was told by J. Giffen, president of an American trading consortium, who intends to sign a long-term agreement soon to create 15-20 joint enterprises in the Soviet Union. According to him, these enterprises will produce food and agricultural commodities worth 5 billion rubles a year.

"But," he continued, "the progress in the disarmament sphere, on geopolitical questions, and in the human rights sphere has not been accompanied by comparable changes in economic ties. Admittedly, hope has appeared that a trade and economic agreement will be signed during the meeting between the two presidents in Washington."

There is indeed also hope of American goodwill on questions of trade and economic ties in the sixth year of

perestroika—after major changes in our country, after an avalanche of change on the European Continent.

The economic aspect of our relations is clearly in need of life-giving stimulus today. Judge for yourselves how things stand. Any serious reasons for retaining the notorious Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which made the granting of most-favored-nation status in trade to us dependent on the Soviet Union's emigration policy, have long since passed. However emigration from the USSR is increasing more and more—so much so that the United States has already refused to accept Soviet Jews as political refugees, thus directing them mainly to Israel. The amendment which was adopted in 1974 by the U.S. Congress with enviable rapidity has just not been repealed.

At first the legislators said that the "impressive scale of emigration" had to become a fact. When it became more than fact, congressmen began to say that it was now necessary to wait for "the freedom to leave and enter the USSR to be recorded in legislation." This, inter alia, was discussed on Capitol Hill last fall during the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's visit there to which I was a direct witness. Months and years go by, optimistic words are spoken in the United States regarding support for perestroika, but the amendment has still not been repealed; that is a step which would give some weight and purpose to these fine speeches.

This amendment had dozens of coauthors. Few people can now be found to get things moving. Many people have condemned Democrat R. Gephardt, deputy leader of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, who has hinted at the need to grant large-scale economic aid to the USSR, as a "politically naive dilettante."

The administration also displayed wary caution for too long, acting circumspectly, rather afraid of attacks from right-wingers who are always dissatisfied and loud-mouthed. The upshot is that time has passed and we are still waiting for results. The White House is only now preparing to grant most-favored-nation status to the Soviet Union on the basis of the temporary suspension of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. And right-wingers consider this excessively generous.

However, for a long time the administration itself was far from becoming a pioneer on this question. In the winter the White House was the only one of the NATO crew to oppose lifting a considerable number of the restrictions on shipments of high-technology goods to the Soviet Union at a routine Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls session. This position changed for the better quite recently, but not without pressure from attendant circumstances.

The U.S. Government was also the only one to advocate restricting the amount of credit that could be granted to the USSR by the international bank that the West is setting up. West Europeans' position on this question was much more constructive.

The White House's protracted waverings on these questions of importance for us have meant the loss of invaluable time and at the same time additional complications in Soviet-U.S. relations in general.

While fully aware of the excessively contradictory political picture in Washington on questions of trade and economic relations with the USSR, the U.S. business world has not been particularly eager to launch itself into the fray either, waiting to see when the U.S. official line would finally be determined. I cannot bring myself to reproach U.S. businessmen for their restraint this time. How many times to our recollection have they fallen victim to both their own naivete and quickness in their endeavor to make a fast buck out of profitable transactions with Soviet foreign trade associations. All this has frequently ended with the White House's putting a strict political curb on business activity, instantly cooling the ardor of those who are too zealous or just banning the implementation of various contracts.

In short, when talk has begun to turn to normalizing USSR-U.S. trade and economic relations over the last few years the business world has motioned to the White House and the administration has motioned to the Congress, but there have not been people in the Congress who were bold enough or took the responsibility to rectify former errors. The upshot is that there were more than enough opportunities and—and this is the main thing—grounds to transfer Soviet-U.S. trade and economic relations to a qualitatively new level over the last few years, but no tangible changes were observed right up until the Malta meeting between the USSR and U.S. leaders.

However, the protracted lack of direction in the elaboration of the official U.S. position was more than compensated by the lively creativity of the masses. Our businessmen's unfettered economic initiative flooded in a mighty upsurge toward U.S. businessman thirstily craving markets and areas to apply capital.

What sparks has the collision of Soviet and American enterprise struck to date? According to WALL STREET JOURNAL data, approximately 1,000 so-called letters of intent have been signed with U.S. businessmen. Approximately 150 joint enterprises have been registered in reality. And, lastly, approximately 35 of them are, effectively, functioning. Let us be blunt and say that you cannot describe this humble bonfire as a fireworks display!

However, countless numbers of our cooperative and state peddlers are now wandering around the cities and villages of America lost in thoughts of what to sell at higher prices and what to buy at lower prices as it were. The only point is that people in the Wild West are, as you know, old hands at that and want to make sure that they do not trade at a loss.

There is no greater mistake than to think that America's businessmen only set their hearts on cooperating with us because of their passion for our perestroika which

bowled them over at a stroke. The West is not built and does not live on sentiment. No secret was made of Western motivation at the international meeting in New York straight after the Malta summit meeting attended by the leaders of world capital. It was said bluntly that the Soviet Union is of interest to Western business for two reasons: first, because it represents a potentially gigantic consumer market and, second, because it is an equally impressive potential market for a cheap work force.

Thus no one ever gave us anything for free, and nor will they.

Americans' complaints regarding our sluggishness on business questions have long since become common knowledge. The mass media here and in our country abounds with examples of urgent letters and telexes to which our departments fail to answer for up to six months. It is probably only the most vivid imagination that would be able to see in this devil-may-care attitude a watchful calculation on the part of those people who are thus combating the infiltration of foreign capital into our homeland.

I have also heard talk here of U.S. business' reluctance to get involved in serious economic ties with us owing to their misgivings generated by the political instability in the USSR and the state of the Soviet economy. "What comment can you pass on these statements?" I asked Giffen. "There is no doubt that the Soviet economy is having difficulties," he replied. "American business is concerned at the changes for the worse and is therefore unwilling to establish contacts. The USSR must, in my view, tackle the primary problem—and stabilize its finances."

The decentralization of our foreign economic activity, which has developed into real guerilla warfare in a number of cases has given rise to an ailment of which we have hitherto heard nothing in our economic relations with the West—insolvency. Evidently, not all of our approximately 12,000 enterprises and associations that have now gained the opportunity to trade on foreign markets are able to settle their hard-currency balance. At any rate, that is how the American press presents the matter, estimating our current debts at \$50-100 million.

Because of the the inability of some of our firms to meet their obligations, relatively small firms are the first to suffer in the West and have in a number of cases already turned to insurance companies to cover their costs. Something else also suffers: trust in us as partners.

Of course one cannot rule out the fact that things of this kind are played up in the U.S. mass media with an ulterior motive: to inspire doubts among the Western business world about our solvency and to smash the tide of interest in economic cooperation with us which is clearly gaining momentum here... But these charges must be taken into account.

It will obviously prove possible during the Washington summit meeting to lift a number of the current political restrictions in Soviet-U.S. trade and economic relations, which will, undoubtedly, be a success of no considerable importance, albeit a belated one. But we must not expect an economic miracle. The size of our country, along with the size of our problems, is such that neither the United States nor the West as a whole can rectify them overnight. It is up to us to resolve these problems.

'Partnership' Seen as Summit's Aim

PM2705113790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Anatoliy Karpychev under the rubric "Politics": "USSR-United States: How Should We Be Known Now?"]

[Text] It was two-and-a-half years ago, in December 1987, that Washington welcomed M.S. Gorbachev. It welcomed him for the first time, even though that was already the third summit meeting, following Geneva and Reykjavik. Nowadays we are somewhat accustomed to such meetings, although each one of them is still an event in itself. At that time, however, we spent several consecutive evenings eagerly following the visit's progress, beginning with the solemn ceremony outside the White House. I do not know whether anyone noticed the very first words spoken by former President Ronald Reagan, but they were certainly not uttered for the sake of diplomatic pleasantries. This is what he said, addressing the Soviet visitor:

"I have received a multitude of leaders of foreign states over the last seven years. Today's visit, however, probably surpasses in significance many of those preceding it insofar as it is a meeting of rival rather than of allies."

The president did not specify what sort of "rivals." We did not ask, either, but it was clear that this formula, which set the tone for the entire Washington meeting, was intended to replace stereotypes developed by both sides during the "cold war"—like "enemy image," "evil empire," "imperialist sharks"—but the fresh apple from the old propaganda apple tree did not roll too far away from it. Even so, we were no longer enemies, and this is good.

It is also good that everything flows, everything changes... Not as fast as expected at times, much more swiftly than desired at others; but everything that changes is either attributable to something or measurable against something else. And so, President Bush remarked a few days ago that relations between our countries are much better than in the past but are still not as good as he would wish. I think that our own president would also like something more. For example, he would like to lay a sound economic basis beneath our collaboration. And why not? It is time... But if both sides wish for more, I would immediately ask myself: How should we be known now?

Allies? In all likelihood, such a formulation of the question would bring a smile to many of our politicians' faces. But let us not be too hasty with rejections. We are not starting from scratch. After all, we have already been allies—during the grim war against fascism. Why should we not be allies in peacetime? As far as I can understand, it is the new political thinking and realities, rather than current dogmas, that make us view the question of allies already from an angle that is different from the one we are accustomed to. It was only yesterday that we described as allies those who belonged only to the socialist camp, confessed only our ideology, and did our bidding; all the rest on the other side of the "iron curtain" were adversaries... Of course, the very idea of alliance will evidently have to undergo very far-reaching changes in the future. Not one alliance against another, not a wall up against another, but unity [yedineniye] for the sake of life and noble goals—this is how I perceive the future.

But if we are not allies today, does this mean that—in Reagan's simple terms—we still remain rivals? Perhaps this is no longer so today. It seems to me that this formula suits the Americans better than it suits us, because it enables them to openly bank on strength. It is somewhat unseemly to laud the cult of strength with allies or partners for example, but it is perfectly befitting to do so with rivals. Banking on strength is suitable for both domestic and foreign consumption. In the first case, U.S. citizens are being taught the idea of a strong and proud America, an America which has forced the Soviet Union to become more tractable and more amenable. In the second case, America generally emerges as the sole defender of the West's ideological values, a committed champion of freedom and human rights, a country that can be relied on.

It must be said that the West possesses an enviable skill of coining brief and expressive formulas for its actions, for expressing its attitude toward issues. Some people might find this nothing but an amusing triviality in big-time politics. Not so. What I perceive behind this triviality is an important element of propaganda backup for its policy. We are still unable to do this. The West has also thought up a few things about us like, for example, "the Gorbachev challenge," that "it is universally recognized by the rest of the world that his diplomacy of compromises and soft reasoning is changing the Soviet Union's reputation and influence," and so on. We, by the way, are better skilled in complicating matters to such an extent that at times one feels helpless in the face of some Foreign Ministry explanations in the press about "balanced packages of solutions," the ability to correctly put them together, and even more so in the ability to find a way to untangle "small and large knots." Nobody would dispute that the "untangling of small and large knots" involves tremendously hard work, but the point I am making is that this work should be understandable by the people. No matter what finer points may have been agreed about ALCM's [air-launched cruise missiles] (just try and figure out what that stands for), no matter how

many times the "frock coats" may be changed, we ordinary mortals simply cannot figure everything through. Nor do we have access to places where the "changes" occur. What we do want to know, however, is the actual effect the efforts by our foreign policy—and the results of the Washington summit meeting in particular—will have on our society's state of mind. The desire to know is one of our rights.

We must have a clear idea of our role in the community of states. I for one totally dislike the "rival" image which wise mentors have cultivated in the civilized world since "time immemorial," thus doing us a great favor. I also dislike the euphoria which springs up every time a success is scored by our foreign policy. On a calmer note, I think that today is a time for partnership rather than for cutthroat rivalry. For four decades now Mars, the god of war, has been fueling confrontation, mistrust, and enmity. Let our relations today be looked after by Mercury, the god of commerce. Especially since we are familiar with and like his dynamic image. Especially since partnership, rather than confrontation, is the real goal of our movement toward each other. In politics, in the economy, in spiritual life—everywhere. Of course, it is not easy to build up the "partner image," but it would be a logical incarnation of the changes occurring in the world.

Let us change the "rival image" into a "partner image"—this is the proposal I would submit for our president's consideration on his way to the summit meeting.

Bessmertnykh on U.S. Preparations for Summit

*LD3005044290 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0400 GMT 30 May 90*

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Washington, 29 May [dateline as received]—Final preparations for the arrival of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev are being completed in the U.S. capital. The Soviet leader's second official visit to the United States, planned for 30 May to 4 June will begin on Wednesday at 1830 Washington time, when the Soviet airliner will arrive from Montreal at Andrews Air Base near Washington.

The U.S. leadership is preparing carefully and thoughtfully for the forthcoming meeting, and on the whole is expecting good results from it, said Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR ambassador to the United States, to TASS correspondents. The new Soviet ambassador made this conclusion following a conversation with George Bush which took place when he presented the U.S. President with his credentials on Tuesday. George Bush, he said, touched on the nature of the present state of Soviet-U.S. relations during the conversation, and also on prospects for their development. The President noted that both questions of a conceptual nature and those connected

with specific areas of cooperation will be among the problems under discussion during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit.

Speaking about particular features of the Soviet president's current visit to the United States, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh noted that the opportunity is now there to visit not only the capital, but also the heart of the United States, and to meet with broad circles of the public and the business world. Americans have shown great interest in connection with Mikhail Gorbachev's intention to visit Minneapolis and San Francisco, but it is not only the inhabitants of these two cities who are preparing for the visit; business circles in other parts of the middle west and the west coast of the United States also are voicing their interest in the meetings planned there. Applications to request taking part in them, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh stated, are coming in from various quarters, even in these last few hours before the USSR president's arrival in the United States. On the whole, he said, it is the general opinion of the American people that the present political dialogue between the USSR and the United States comprises a realistic, businesslike, and pragmatic program.

Solton Reviews Past U.S.-Soviet Summits

*LD2905135190 Moscow World Service in English
1110 GMT 29 May 90*

[Text] Two years ago on 29 May Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan met in Moscow. The meeting became a landmark in the chronicle of Soviet-American relations. Today on the eve of Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with George Bush in Washington it would be appropriate to recall the highlights of that Moscow meeting, and here is what Yuriy Solton writes in this connection.

The central event of the then Moscow meeting was the exchange of the instruments of ratification in keeping with which the treaty on elimination of Soviet and American medium- and shorter-range missiles came into effect. Thus the epoch of nuclear disarmament was launched. I recall that there were quite a few sceptics at the time, both here and in the United States, who questioned the reasonable nature of the agreement and predicted all kinds of troubles and difficulties. The gloomy predictions have failed to justify. [sentence as heard]. The sides have been strictly abiding by the provisions of the treaty and thus contributing to the improvement of the international situation. The sophisticated verification mechanism works faultlessly. In a year neither the Soviet Union nor the United States will have a single missile of those two classes left. The leaders of the two countries agreed then in Moscow not to stop at that, but to move further towards bringing about a radical reduction of strategic offensive weapons limiting nuclear tests and eliminating chemical weapons. Today one can state with satisfaction that we're standing on the threshold of practical agreements on those important problems.

And there is one more point as well. Soviet-American top-level meetings have become regular. Every such meeting is a blow on the cold war. When Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush met on Malta last December they arrived at the conclusion during their talks that the cold war period was coming to an end or even had come to an end. And this is really so. Now the presidents of the two countries should think about the new type of relations in the new period. Are such relations really possible if we know that the Soviet Union and the United States have different approaches to a number of serious problems? To find a mutually acceptable variant is a big policy. It's a difficult policy as well, but radical changes in relations between the two countries in the last two years give us hope. We, as Mikhail Gorbachev has just declared in an interview with the American weekly magazine *TIME*, have begun developing new relations after agreeing that the differences between us, first of all, are amenable to solution, and, secondly, are less important than new problems common to all humanity, but problems that can be resolved only through a dialogue and cooperation, through joint efforts.

It's most reassuring, writes Yuriy Solton, that today the two presidents, both Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, are for cherishing and multiplying all that has been achieved in Soviet-American relations. These relations, of course, will be put to test many times more in the future. The best guarantee against any stepping back are all the new steps forward in disarmament, in economic and cultural contacts, and in simple human contacts. Let this be our wish made to the Soviet-American top level meeting just on the eve of its opening.

James Baker Denies 'Sell-Out' to Soviet Union

PM2905151190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 May 90 Moscow Evening Edition p 1

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Shalnev under the "Abroad" rubric: "Selling Out U.S. Interests?"]

[Text] Washington—When several publications carry simultaneous items that are not only about the same subject but also use roughly the same arguments, it is not hard to guess that a propaganda campaign is being mounted.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, THE WASHINGTON TIMES, and THE WASHINGTON POST—to mention just central publications—have carried a number of articles in the past few days from which it follows that at the recent talks in Moscow U.S. Secretary of State James Baker quite simply "sold America out to the Kremlin." The concessions which he made in order to reach an agreement on arms controls only mean one thing: "Our store is sold out."

I am not going to start establishing precisely who is setting in motion this increasingly obvious campaign.

But it must be noted that it is being taken very seriously by the administration, and by the State Department and the White House in particular.

At a press conference held on Wednesday Secretary of State James Baker devoted a great deal of time to refuting accusations that America has apparently sold out to the Kremlin. One of the basic arguments he put forward was as follows: The agreements reached with Moscow fully meet the interests of U.S. national security, and the fact that the agreements have been strongly supported by the U.S. military leadership testifies to this. As far as the criticisms made of the results of the Moscow talks is concerned, J. Baker continued, "the criticism is coming mainly from those who, in the past, tried to reject the very concept of arms control."

James Baker did not just talk about military matters at the press conference he held in the White House. And he was not just asked about arms control. He was asked the following question, among others: "Tell us, when Bush sits down at the negotiating table with Gorbachev, will the Soviet president be the stronger or weaker partner, compared with what happened in Malta?"

The answer: "I am not sure if I can make absolute judgments on this subject. There are still a number of problems in the Soviet Union. These problems also existed when the leaders met in Malta. But since then President Gorbachev has established and strengthened his political positions—if we are talking about his positions within the political system in the Soviet Union... But the economic problems remain, the ethnic problems remain. And therefore, I do not think that I can answer your question categorically one way or the other."

Answering other questions, Secretary of State Baker noted: "We have not changed our viewpoint with respect to what we believe to be important in order for perestroika to be successful. From our viewpoint, the success of perestroika will manifest itself as a more open, more stable, and more secure Soviet Union. And that, of course, is in the best interests of the United States..."

Judging by J. Baker's statements, a number of these problems will be put on the agenda by the American side at the Washington summit. In particular, as Baker announced, President Bush intends to pay great attention to the discussion of questions connected with the situation in the Baltic republics. According to him, the President is also interested in finding out from President Gorbachev his assessment of the state of affairs in the Soviet economy. From the viewpoint of the White House, Baker said, "the Soviets themselves must make a difficult choice if they want their economic reforms to be successful."

And what do the predictions of the secretary of state look like as a whole?

"We expect real progress on the full range of issues in our relations, and on arms control in particular. At the same time we realize that there are still differences of opinion.

But we also realize that if we want to progress through dialogue from conflict to cooperation, then together with our Soviet colleagues we must seek mutual benefits."

U.S. 'Linkage' of Trade to Politics Criticized

LD2905140290 Moscow TASS in English 1354 GMT
29 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—What hinders the development of trade and economic relations? Nikolay Neiman, secretary of the Soviet Parliament's Committee for International Affairs, told TASS that this to a great extent has been caused by the U.S. side's "linkage" of the development of business contacts with the adoption of a Soviet bill on entry and departure and with the solution of problems connected with the situation in Lithuania.

Touching upon the adoption of the entry and exit bill, the Soviet deputy recalled that 15 years ago that the well-known Jackson-Vanik amendment made the granting of most favoured nation trading status to the Soviet Union dependent on Soviet emigration policy.

One can now hear some pronouncements in the U.S. press that the Soviet Union is artificially delaying the adoption of the entry and exit bill which is a central part of the legislative package promoting the exercise of human rights.

"Such assertions are totally unfounded," Neiman emphasised, pointing out that the first reading of the bill was considered in the Soviet Parliament several months ago.

Asked why the adoption of the bill is somewhat delayed, Neiman said the agenda of the current session of the Soviet Parliament is rather packed: The session is discussing the government programme for a transition to a regulated market economy and is considering acts on pensions and other measures that are most important for socio-economic reforms.

Neiman did not rule out that the second reading of the bill may be considered at the end of next week. "This is one of the basic acts promoting the exercise of human rights in the Soviet Union," he emphasised.

"The freedom of entry into the Soviet Union and departure from it must undoubtedly exist, but the main thing, in my view, is to do it so that Soviet people could fully realise their abilities and opportunities at home. This is why we so persistently work on the creation of the necessary appropriate socio-economic conditions for living in the Soviet Union."

PRAVDA Assesses U.S.-Soviet Trade Prospects

96UFO187A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[Article by V. Kikilo: "USSR-United States: Trade Prospects"]

[Text] "Hard currency, red tape, noninterfacing of economic mechanisms"—such, in the words of Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador in Moscow, are the main obstacles currently hampering the normal development of Soviet-American trade. The diplomat shared his viewpoint, buttressed by long experience of work in the USSR, with the participants in 13th annual meeting of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council held in the Soviet capital.

For many years the council, housed in a skyscraper on Manhattan's Third Avenue in New York, has been an active intermediary in contacts between business circles of the USSR and the United States. And, it would seem, it is not its fault that the indicator on the control panel of the trade and economic relations of the two powers continues to burn at barely half-strength as yet.

What, then, is impeding the rapid expansion of the economic cooperation of the Soviet Union and the United States? After all, the political situation in the world has changed. The leaders of the USSR and the United States proclaimed at the Malta meeting the end of the "cold war." And the American officials present at the Moscow session of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council themselves were saying openly that the political obstacles to the development of bilateral trade are vanishing. The volume of trade of \$5 billion, which is composed mainly of the sale to us of American grain, what is more, manifestly fails to correspond to the tremendous possibilities of the two countries. What is wrong?

In the opinion of many businessmen from the United States, the present problems are thrown into the greatest relief in such a new and progressive form of cooperation as the creation of joint ventures. As Thomas Duesterberg, assistant U.S. secretary of commerce, said, of the 1,400 such ventures registered at the present time in the USSR, 140 have been created with the participation of American partners. And of these, less than 15 percent have really involved themselves in business transactions. The question addressed to Soviet representatives: Why does so much time elapse between the signing of a statement of intent concerning the creation of a joint venture and its registration, could be heard repeatedly in these past few days. It received no meaningful answer. But it is obvious—bureaucratic red tape. This problem could most likely be solved by organizational measures—the transfer of power

of registration to independent authorities, which would be guided not by departmental interests but the provisions of the law. Such a serious problem for Western businessmen as premises, transportation, and communications could also be resolved in centralized manner, perhaps.

Things are more complex when it comes to such a question as the impossibility of foreigners obtaining rubles in hard currency on account of the nonconvertibility of the ruble. And abundant food for thought here is afforded by figures adduced by Yu.A. Znamenskiy, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Foreign Economic Relations. It transpires that the amount of above-quota capital construction or "incompletes" in the Soviet Union currently constitutes 40 billion rubles. Approximately 6 million tons of rolled metal, 30 million tons of cement, and 15 million cubic meters of lumber are "frozen" due to this. In hard currency equivalent, so needed by the country, this amounts to \$17 billion. Some of these necrotic facilities could, according to Yu.A. Znamenskiy, be sold on international industrial real estate markets as a contribution to joint ventures, or be put on long-term lease.

According to the Soviet representatives, intensive work is under way currently in order to try and reduce to a minimum the "noninterfacing" of the two countries' economic mechanisms. To this end the government is preparing for Supreme Soviet approval a whole package of foreign economic bills, on customs, foreign investments, taxes, patents, banking and such included.

Business circles of the two countries also attach serious hopes to the draft trade agreement between the USSR and the United States prepared for the Washington summit.

U.S. Senator Analyzes Soviet Economic Problems

PM2905151990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by George Mitchell, leader of the Democratic Majority in the U.S. Senate: "We Can Offer Our Own Experience"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] In the runup to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States the IZVESTIYA editorial office has asked a number of prominent U.S. politicians and public figures to express their opinion of Soviet-U.S. relations in our newspaper. We are publishing the article by George Mitchell, leader of the Democratic Majority in the U.S. Senate.

I was happy to visit the Soviet Union again, for the second time, in April. I was staggered by the splendid positive changes that have taken place in the country. Nonetheless my main impression was that despite the exciting evolution toward democracy and freedom Soviet people are up against great problems.

Although the situation in the Baltic states and the question of whether the federation will hold out against

disintegration seem the most pressing problems at the present time, I nonetheless think that economic reform is the most important test for the country. The country is not standing up to this test at the moment.

Failure will signal ill fortune both for the Soviet people and the entire world. The United States backs the Soviet Union's efforts designed to legislatively enshrine more substantial political and economic freedoms and to ensure that resources from the military sphere are channeled into meeting consumer needs.

Nonetheless, President Gorbachev told me that "economic reform is lagging behind political reform. This will lead to difficulties and... will affect the people's attitude toward perestroika." Tangible economic results are of critical importance in order to win the people's support—support for the whole reform program in the USSR.

Realizing this, President Gorbachev has stressed the need for a program of radical economic reforms. He has pointed out the need for a new price system, a new banking system, and, possibly, the need for a stock market.

Unfortunately, the Soviet Government has no option now but to take truly radical steps like those adopted in Poland. I am afraid that a phased process implemented piecemeal may prove too little too late.

The obstacles on the path to economic viability are obvious: The vast, overcentralized, and inefficient Soviet economy as well as the political and social cost of implementing substantial reforms. Quite understandably, Soviet people want the improvement to happen immediately. But a direct switch to the market economy will result—in the short term—in deprivations. Things will get worse before they get better.

There is a dilemma. As President Gorbachev has said, "people worry when they think that the pace of the reform is too slow. But they are also worried by the steps that must be taken in order to give the reforms a more radical character." I sincerely hope that Soviet people can understand the importance of the problems which they are facing and will manage to find the will to meet the challenge.

The United States cannot resolve the Soviet economy's problems. We can offer our experience and knowledge. I hope that we will soon be able to normalize our trade relations.

But ultimately the choice must be made by Soviet people and their leaders—the choice of the difficult path of reforms. The longer the implementation of meaningful reforms is delayed, the harder it will be to rejuvenate the economy and build a more prosperous future.

We in America sincerely hope that Soviet people have the faith and confidence to choose that difficult but vitally important path.

The Soviet Union is a land with extraordinary natural and human resources, the first country in the world to launch a satellite into space. I am sure that if Soviet people set their minds to it they will cope with their economic problems.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Speech on Asia-Pacific Policy Expected

OW3005053090 Tokyo NHK General Television
Network in Japanese 0300 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] It was learned on 29 May that Soviet President Gorbachev will stop over in Kamchatka on 5 June following the U.S.-Soviet summit in Washington. In view of his Japan visit next year, he will reveal a new Asia-Pacific policy.

This was reported by JIJI from Moscow, quoting a Soviet source. According to the report, President Gorbachev, after attending the U.S.-Soviet summit in Washington, will fly from San Francisco to Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy, capital of Kamchatka Oblast, on 5 June and will meet with local officials and citizens. He will be there until 7 June.

The Soviet source said that while there, President Gorbachev will make an important speech on the Soviet Union's new Asia-Pacific policy with his visit to Japan next year in mind. His speech will be his third foreign policy speech dealing with the Asia-Pacific region, following his Vladivostok speech in 1986 announcing a dramatic improvement in relations with China and his Krasnoyarsk speech in 1988 announcing an emphasis on economic ties with Asian nations. Attention is being focused on what he will say about Japan.

With Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy being a military port of the Soviet Pacific Fleet, it is possible that he will announce a new unilateral reduction of Soviet Armed Forces in the Far East or make a new proposal on reducing U.S. and Soviet naval forces.

Soviet-DPRK Economic, Science Ties Analyzed

SK2205120690 Moscow International Service in Korean
1330 GMT 21 May 90

[Talk by station commentator (Sergeyev) from the "Annals of Friendship" program—read by announcers]

[Text] [First announcer] Dear listeners: As we have already reported, a 24th meeting of the Soviet-Korean Intergovernmental Consultative Committee on Economic and Scientific and Technological Affairs was held in Pyongyang awhile ago. Our station commentator (Sergeyev) writes:

[Second announcer] First of all, I recall the fact that this committee was established about 25 years ago and that urgent issues on cooperation in economic and scientific and technological sectors are discussed in meetings that

are held alternately in Moscow and Pyongyang. Economic and scientific and technological ties between our two countries have a history that spans many years. However, under today's circumstances, these ties must become more efficient and must greatly contribute to carrying out (?priority) tasks in the people's economy and must produce great mutual benefits. Causes for this phenomenon and mutual cooperation and its prospects in the near future were discussed at the Pyongyang meeting. The (?social significance) of the decisions adopted in Pyongyang is satisfactory. The two countries will see much progress in their collectivization of the manufacturing of clothes, shoes, semi-manufactured products, and other light industrial goods, for example.

As they did last year, this year DPRK peasants will raise dry paddy crops and grain in Primorskiy Kray, Khabarovsk Kray, and Amur Province together with Soviet comrades. DPRK construction offices will build inns in Vladivostok, Khabarovsk, and Nakhodka; an acrobatic theater in Khabarovsk; and other social and cultural buildings. They will also build other facilities.

Activities of Soviet-Korean joint ventures were also discussed in Pyongyang. This is of particular significance under current circumstances. [words indistinct] these enterprises and Korean-food restaurants are being run. Measures will be taken to upgrade these enterprises. An agreement was reached to further enhance cooperation in the power industrial sector. Our country will help build Tongpyongyang thermal power station, which has a capacity of 200,000 kw, and other power stations and will help conduct inquiries for building an atomic power station. Direct ties for joint manufacturing will be established between the shipyards of the two countries. Upon the receipt of the Soviet Union's order, the DPRK shipyards will build several not-so-large ships for inland voyages.

It was also predicted that direct ties between complexes and research institutes will expand. For example, a protocol on cooperation was signed between (Pesbar) rice studies institute and the rice studies institute under the DPRK Academy of Agricultural Sciences. Soviet and Korean scholars exchange (?data) on protecting rice from insects. Scientific institutes of the two countries who study the machine manufacturing industry, medicine, and the microbiological sector have direct ties.

In this meeting, a protocol for commodities and payment for 1990 was signed between the Soviet Union and the DPRK. According to this protocol, the Soviet Union will supply the DPRK with machines, equipment, petroleum and petroleum products, coke, and other commodities that are important to the Republic. In the meantime, the DPRK will export metal-cutting machine tools, batteries, barite, zinc, magnesia clinker, and people's consumer goods to our country.

I will tell you another important fact: In (?credit) transactions, a mutual agreement in principle was reached on [words indistinct] and the settlement of accounts with convertible currencies.

[Second announcer] In conclusion, our station commentator (Sergeyev) writes that [words indistinct] of the 24th meeting of the Soviet-Korean Intergovernmental Committee will greatly contribute to resolving social and economic tasks for our two countries.

Kim Il-song Reelection as DPRK President Noted
SK2505092190 Moscow International Service in Korean
1100 GMT 24 May 90

[Text] DPRK President Kim Il-song has confirmed that his country is allegiant to the principle of socialist development. At the same time, he has noted that socialism is a basic direction of historical progress.

He spoke at the session of the Supreme People's Assembly (SPA) of the republic held in Pyongyang today. Kim Il-song has been reelected 5-year-term [as heard] DPRK president.

The SPA session formed the National Defense Commission and Kim Il-song has been elected its chairman. His son Kim Chong-il has been elected its first vice chairman.

DPRK Hands Over Remains of Five U.S. Soldiers
SK2905122590 Moscow International Service in Korean
1100 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] The DPRK handed over the remains of five U.S. soldiers who were recognized as missing during the Korean war. The ceremony of delivering the remains was held for the first time [words indistinct] at the demarcation line in Panmunjom. Eight U.S. congressmen participated in the ceremonies. The U.S. State Department said that this humanitarian expression was [passage indistinct]. The DPRK and the United States have no diplomatic relations.

Japan's Apology to Korean People Analyzed
SK2905124090 Moscow International Service in Korean
0900 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Talk by station commentator (Sergey Petrov)—read by announcer]

[Text] During the talks with ROK President No Tae-u, who has been in Tokyo on an official visit, Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu officially apologized to the Korean people for sufferings and misfortunes that were inflicted upon the Korean people during Japan's colonial occupation of Korea. Also, Emperor Akihito; Sakurachi, speaker of the Japanese Diet; and Doi, chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Japan Socialist Party made the same remarks. In connection with this, our station commentator (Sergey Petrov) writes:

The apology by the Japanese political figures for Japan's responsibility for having annexed Korea from 1910 until 1945 and for consequences that have arisen from this

annexation throughout the post-war period is unprecedented. In doing this, they reflect Tokyo's hopes to conclude this issue once and for all as early as possible. This is proven by what representatives of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs had said just before President No Tae-u visited Japan. They called for not paying too much attention to this issue and for looking to the future.

The Korean Government appears to be of the same opinion. According to the YONHAP NEWS AGENCY, Yu Chong-ha, ROK vice minister of foreign affairs, declared that the ROK would not refer to the issue of Japan's responsibility any more. Both sides think that this stand is necessary in order to further promote bilateral cooperation. However, if this cooperation is not to cause a new tragic error, they must not forget the past.

Then, can one say that a new chapter has opened in relations between the Japanese people and the Korean people? I do not think that this is true. Many questions still remain. Among them, does Tokyo's apology refer only to the South Korean people? Or, does it refer to all the Korean people who suffered from Japan's occupation? Also, when will Japan make a similar apology to the DPRK people, the Korean people on Sakhalin Island of the Soviet Union, and people of other Asian countries who were dragged into the Japanese militarists' so-called Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere? Or, is Japan's apology selective?

Japanese public persons do not appear to think of their moral duty but their own interests. Seoul has become Japan's strong competitor in economic fields and is actively infiltrating into places where Japanese products have seen no competitors. I think this has led Tokyo to make a marked apology. Japan apologized to South Korea and promised to give material compensation to Korean people who suffered from the U.S. dropping the atomic bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Almost all the Korean people in Japan will enjoy the same rights as the Japanese people from the year's end. However, this will not relieve Japanese society of its moral responsibility. I would like to hope that this positive measure by the Japanese Government, which had been delayed for 45 years, will not be the last in this direction, and that this will help objectively write some chapters of Japanese history.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S.-Philippine Military Base Negotiations Slow

Deadlock in Talks Reviewed

HK2305052790 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines
1300 GMT 22 May 90

[Commentary by Viktor Vladimirov]

[Text] Before the start of talks on the military bases, the American Ambassador to the Philippines Nicholas Platt

declared that Washington intends to keep its bases in the country. The talks in Manila began on this note. But after a week of discussions, both sides were deadlocked.

Manila advised the Washington delegation that the bases' agreement would not be extended, and that the present agreement expires in September 1991. Was this a decision made by the Aquino Government whereby next year will be the final one for the bases? It is still too early to say for sure, especially since Washington is engaging in many maneuvers to pressure Manila to agree to a new treaty.

The main issue involves the financial question, especially since the Philippine foreign debt is a very large one. Added to this is the fact that the dismantling of the bases will affect some 70,000 Filipinos working in them. This would mean an end to the input of dollars derived from payments for the use of the military facilities.

Washington has also warned that if the talks do not produce good results, the Philippines can expect to receive no financial assistance in future. So it seems unlikely that the Philippines will let go of any financial benefits, especially as the country faces financial difficulties.

In this regard, many experts are predicting the likelihood of the military bases staying on, especially since the United States seems amenable to settling some of the Philippines' debts. But differences remain on both sides, such as those involving military, medical and food aid.

Despite the deadlock, it has been announced that the talks will resume next month, and Washington is sure to take advantage of all its opportunities.

While all this goes on, so do protests by groups opposed to the retention of the military bases. Senator Wigberto Tanada has pointed out that with all the changes going on around the world, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region, it is no longer necessary to retain the military bases. Senator Tanada's view is one which has the greatest support from the Filipinos.

Resumption of Talks Announced

*HK2205032390 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines
1300 GMT 21 May 90*

[Text] United States and Philippine Government officials will meet again in Manila next month to continue the talks on the future of the U.S. military bases in the country. This was announced by a member of the Philippine delegation. The talks were suspended last week. The official said Washington asked for the talks to resume, and he reported that Manila was insisting that Washington treat the Philippines as a free and sovereign nation.

Last Friday, the Aquino Government declared it was prepared to resume the talks on condition that the United States settle its debt amounting to \$222 million for its use of the military facilities.

For its part, Washington has said there is no outstanding debt. This the reason the talks were halted.

Pressure for Bases' Retention Reported

*HK3005024990 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines
1300 GMT 29 May 90*

[Text] Pressure will probably be exerted on the Philippine Government to make it agree to a new treaty extending the stay of the American military bases in the country. President Corazon said this to reporters, adding that neighboring countries of the Philippines are hoping the present administration will agree to a new treaty.

In the light of this, President Aquino said that her administration will resist all outside pressure, particularly those based on growing reports that Japan is urging the Philippines to allow the bases to stay on for a longer period.

Near East & South Asia

International Middle East Conference Urged

*LD2905121990 Moscow TASS in English 1209 GMT
29 May 90*

[By TASS political analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The administration of the United States requested Arab leaders to abandon support of an international conference on Middle East under the Aegis of the United Nations.

According to Reuters, this address was put forth in a letter, that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker sent to the Arab summit in Baghdad.

Such a turn in American politics is unexpected, although it could have been predicted.

Official U.S. representatives have for several months been trying to avoid mentioning an international conference on the Middle East, putting emphasis on direct talks between Palestinians and Israelis—as a panacea for a Middle East settlement.

True, U.S. support to the international conference has been weak in the past and boiled down to discussing it as a forum that could cement results reached during bilateral talks.

The change in Washington's position was most likely prompted by the "Baker Plan", which proposes elections in the occupied Arab territories and subsequent dialogue between Palestinian delegations and the Israeli Government.

However, the Shamir government's obstructionist policy and the explosive situation created by it on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip doom the U.S. plan.

This means that there is no alternative to an international conference. There is a wide-ranging consensus in

the world in favour of such a forum: The idea is supported by the Soviet Union, East European countries, EC members, the Arab world and many Muslim states in Asia.

They agree that the conference is an effective way out to find a comprehensive, lasting and just settlement in the Middle East.

The internationalisation of the Arab-Israeli conflict requires collective efforts from member-countries of the United Nations with due regard to the interests of various states and conflicting parties in order to find a balance of interests and acceptable solutions.

The Soviet Union, not excluding a direct dialogue between Palestinians and Israelis, support multilateral efforts to solve the Middle East problem.

A conference is the only real way to help Palestinians regain their motherland. It will bring lasting peace and security to the people of Israel and the Arab People.

TASS Reports Renewed Violence in Afghanistan

*LD2905133990 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT
29 May 90*

[Text] Kabul May 29 TASS—In the past 24 hours extremists resumed their shelling of the Afghan capital, firing 22 U.S.-made cluster rockets at its residential areas. The shelling left six people dead, 20 wounded, and several houses destroyed.

BAKHTAR News Agency reported that deputies at the Loya Jerga (National Congress) endorsed amendments and changes to the Afghan constitution. These included removing the clause giving the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan a monopoly on power, depoliticisation of the court and procurator's office, and giving wider freedom to private business.

Government troops in Khowst district continue to beat back attacks by the opposition. After defensive battles, the Khowst garrison launched a counter offensive, killing and wounding in the past four days some 500 rebels and Pakistani and Saudi mercenaries. A convoy with arms and two rocket launchers was seized. Ten people were killed and 13 wounded on the government side.

Two opposition groups comprising 35 people laid down their arms in the ghor province.

Islamabad May 29 TASS—The Pakistani newspaper FRONTIER POST reports that leader of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan Gulbuddin Hekmetyar is seriously concerned by the threat of assassination by the U.S. CIA. The newspaper notes that the group has documentary evidence of a CIA plan to physically eliminate the party leadership. This is allegedly connected with U.S. accusations that this leadership is involved in drug trafficking and political murders.

Pakistani-Indian Relations Seen Deteriorating

*PM2905100190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 May 90 First Edition p 7*

[TASS report: "Relations Deteriorating"]

[Text] Delhi, 28 May—The Indian public is seriously concerned about reports published by the local press today on Pakistani military preparations. Citing the London-published SUNDAY TIMES, the local press writes that a U.S. reconnaissance satellite recorded a carefully guarded convoy of trucks leaving the supersecret nuclear research complex in the town of Kahuta in the direction of an airbase.

Experts do not rule out the possibility that nuclear devices were being carried. The pictures also reveal attachments to allow nuclear bombs to be fixed to F-16 fighter-bombers. These facts, in the CIA's opinion, show the likely use by Pakistan of nuclear weapons in the event of a military conflict with India in the Kashmir region.

The press also features reports that the Americans have allegedly "obtained detailed information" on India's preparations for war. "According to this information," THE HINDUSTAN TIMES writes, "the republic's troop concentration on the border with Pakistan has considerably increased over the past three weeks." It is thought, the newspaper writes, that India, too, has nuclear weapons and "signs have been seen" of Delhi's "readiness" to use them.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Superpowers' Role in Ethiopian Solution Viewed

*AB2205230090 Moscow International Service
in Somali 1600 GMT 21 May 90*

[Text] The threat of mass starvation in Ethiopia is worrying the international community. Recently, U.S. congressmen called upon George Bush, the U.S. President and Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet president, to include in the agenda of their forthcoming meeting ways to save the millions of starving people in northern Ethiopia.

Our commentator, Vladimir Borisov, said that the current situation in Ethiopia was one of severe hunger and internal strife, and more bloodshed than anywhere else in the world. The two aspects in the matter are closely connected. The war going on between the government and the revolutionaries in the northern regions of Eritrea and Tigray is exacerbating the effects of the famine, and this situation cannot be tolerated.

Experts from international organizations estimate that famine threatens 4 million people in those regions and others neighboring them in Ethiopia. Since the Eritrean secessionists captured the port of Mitsiwa on the Red Sea—the largest port in the country—in mid-February,

there have been severe setbacks in the efforts of international charitable organizations to bring food into northern Ethiopia. Although planes fly there regularly, they cannot deliver all the necessary cargo. At the same time, the war is intensifying and the battle is now on for the capture of Asmera, which is the capital of Eritrea. That was the reason for the U.S. congressmen's appeal. The appeal is very timely now because the conflict in the Horn of Africa has reached a virtual impasse.

The continuation of the war by the two parties is leading to an ugly situation. The international community's appeal for an end to the conflict has not yet borne fruit. The war has not let up even for a short time, even though it is clear that it may lead to the deaths of millions of innocent people. The attempt to involve the government of Addis Ababa and the Eritrean and Tigray revolutionaries in talks failed. However, the leaders of the two superpowers may create real hope for a settlement of this issue.

It would not be surprising if the first manifestation of such hopes was a resumption of the peace contacts abandoned by the rebels. It is not yet possible to say what concrete things the superpowers may do to help negotiations in the Horn of Africa. Clearly the work to find ways of reaching agreement and settling the difficult points of dispute which divided the two sides requires much time. It is also clear that many countries in the international community need to participate in this work, along with the United Nations itself. The fact that the two superpowers have quickly gained the experience necessary to resolve conflicts in the world is cause for optimism. A clear example of this is the role played by all parties in settling the difficult problem of South Africa.

There is no doubt that the appeal addressed to the leaders of the superpowers will get a response. This is demonstrated by the joint U.S. and Soviet statements in which they have expressed their readiness to participate in the peace talks. They called on [word indistinct] many times on the opposing sides. Undoubtedly, a major successful result depends on the leaders of the opposing sides and their efforts.

Our commentator, Vladimir Borisov, ended his commentary by saying: I think it is necessary today to remove political arrogance from the efforts towards peace talks, and hold peace talks with the knowledge born of discipline, recognizing the responsibility for the future of the citizens, and that nobody else can be responsible for that.

Moiseyev Meets With Mozambican Chief of Staff

*PM2405152990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 24 May 90 First Edition p 3*

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first

deputy defense minister, met with Lieutenant General Antonio Hama Thai, chief of General Staff and Mozambican deputy defense minister, who is visiting the Soviet Union, 22 May.

During the meeting, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, they discussed questions of mutual interest.

East Europe

Zubkov Interviews Southern Force Commander

LD2705225390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 25 May carries a 40-minute feature on life in Hungary. The feature is presented by Georgiy Zubkov. He discusses the Balaton song festival, Hungarian wedding traditions, grape growing, the sights of Budapest, and concludes with an interview with Colonel General Matvey Prokopyevich Burlakov, commander of the Southern Group of Forces.

Burlakov says, "The withdrawal of this group of troops is going strictly according to the schedule, according to the intergovernmental agreement. I must say that by today we have already withdrawn 68 trainloads [eshelon], which is about 5,000 of the personnel [as heard], 320 tanks, more than 1,500 units of military hardware. When asked when the withdrawal will be complete Burlakov says "The withdrawal will end 30 June 1991." Zubkov asks "Are there no extra problems coming up for you, as the commander, reflections, perhaps, in connection with the withdrawal of the troops?" Burlakov replies, "You know, Georgiy Ivanovich, there are some problems of course, which make one think today. First, perestroika has brought about not only new political thinking. It has also (?introduced) new military thinking. The armed forces are being cut, the military budget is being cut. Troops are being withdrawn today from Hungary and Czechoslovakia. All these, of course, are steps taken by the Soviet Union, but unfortunately there are no real answering moves visible. We have marvelous little towns, we have marvelous test sites, we have everything we need for life and combat work today. In the Southern Group of Forces we are withdrawing 11,000 officers and non-commissioned officers, and troop families who do not have apartments. Here in Hungary we are leaving behind 14,500 apartments built out of USSR Ministry of Defense budget." Zubkov says, "You are indeed well provided for here. How are the reciprocal calculations worked out in connection with the withdrawal of the troops?" Burlakov then replies "Today of course we are thinking to sell these material effects of ours here at the prices currently existing in the Hungarian republic. Unfortunately, so far this is turning out difficult. According to the laws of the Hungarian state, which are now being put to us by the Hungarian Government commission, all property built on Hungarian territory is the property of Hungary. We cannot agree to this. Of course, today experts are now going through the question so that justice should triumph and we could realize our

property here, and apply all these funds to building for the troops in the localities where they will be permanently stationed in the territory of the Soviet Union."

Zubkov concludes by saying "Well, I wish you a successful completion of your service here, and future success, too." Burlakov says, "Thank you very much. I think we will meet our task. Of course, our task is a complex one, but the troops are in the mood for withdrawal, and we are tackling this task successfully and shall solve it." The video shows the interview in a park.

Zubkov says that on the streets of Budapest this poster has appeared in connection with the withdrawal of Soviet troops. The video shows a poster of rear view of unattractive military head, with Comrades The End, written in Russian, and Hungarian Democratic Forum written in Hungarian underneath. The poster is signed by the Hungarian Democratic Forum. Obviously it did not remain unnoticed by the Southern Group of Forces, and spokespersons for the Forum were asked about the poster. They referred to the traditional sense of Hungarian humour. Zubkov contrasts the Hungarian poster with a counter-poster put up by Soviet troops, showing a smiling Soviet soldier wishing the Hungarians well, and interviews the owner of the Soviet face who reiterates the sentiment. The feature ends with an interview with Hungarian television journalist about state of media at present.

Nikitin Meets Bulgarian Agriculture Minister

PM2905114990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 22 May V.V. Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received T. Pandov, Bulgarian minister of agriculture and food processing.

Dubcek Holds News Conference in Moscow

LD2505103290 Moscow International Service
in Slovak 1700 GMT 22 May 90

[Report on news conference given by Aleksander Dubcek, chairman of the CSFR Federal Assembly, in Moscow on 21 May, by correspondent Irina Chaykova; Dubcek's recorded remarks in Russian fading into superimposed Czech translation: Chaykova's remarks in Czech]

[Excerpts] [Chaykova] [passage omitted] Do you know, dear listeners what I was thinking of yesterday when I was waiting with my other colleagues for Alexander Dubcek's arrival at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. It occurred to me that a year ago, more precisely in April 1989, I was in this hall at a similar press conference. It was being given by quite a different man. He had also arrived from Czechoslovakia but that is the only similarity. It was Milos Jakes. Journalists literally flooded him with questions about whether Soviet

restructuring can be compared to the Prague Spring of 1968, about the fate of Alexander Dubcek, about the future of Czechoslovakia and various changes. Milos Jakes replied to all these questions in a rather irritated way, I would even say quite aggressively which left those present with a very oppressive feeling. On the subject of Dubcek's fate he said this: Do not worry about him. I do not understand why this man is the center of such interest. It is absolutely obvious that he has lost down the line, that he is a political corpse, and that no one can revive him now. That is what he said, neither more, nor less.

Who would have thought then that everything would change so fundamentally in just a few months. It is now clear who was really the political corpse and who had lost down the line long before, and who was, and continues to be a personality, even though he was once stripped of all his titles and honors.

However, this is just an introduction to the press conference given by Alexander Dubcek in Moscow. It was truly interesting and packed. Let us take it all in order.

The first question put to the chairman of the CSFR Federal Assembly was quite natural and everyone expected it: What were Alexander Dubcek's feelings on his arrival in Moscow after 22 years, and how does he feel here?

[Dubcek] It is the kind of feeling that perhaps I cannot find words for immediately. It is a feeling of satisfaction; a feeling of recognition of my past and everything connected with the Prague Spring of 1968. It is a feeling of political rehabilitation, not just me personally but all those who fought and were reformers with me, with whom we strove 22 years ago to find a new way for the dramatic development of our country, to find a new place in Europe and the world. I think that everything which was in the past has now gone for ever. Today, thank God, is a completely different era. Here in Moscow I met not only with the highest state officials, including USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, but also with ordinary people in the street. I was pleased by their great interest in what is happening today in Czechoslovakia. I could not but feel their sympathies toward our small country. This is the impression which I am taking home with me.

Our countries are linked by many things, ancient spiritual and cultural contacts as well as joint participation in the antifascist struggle in the years of World War II. All this cannot be wiped out, but we are wiping out neo-Stalinism in any form, superpower totalitarian thinking, and we are wiping it out forever. In my view this is the most important thing both for the USSR and Czechoslovakia, and for the whole of central and Eastern Europe.

[Chaykova] The next question put to Alexander Dubcek was: Could you tell us whether you started to establish links with the new Soviet leadership in April 1985 when restructuring started in the USSR, whether you wrote letters to Moscow and if so, to whom?

[Dubcek] I very rarely had the opportunity. We were living in complicated times. From time to time it was possible to send a letter to Moscow with some friends. Our opportunities, however, cannot be exaggerated. However, I was able to take opportunities to express my liking for the Soviet restructuring in interviews to representatives of foreign media. I always did this because for example in the communist press in Italy but not in our country—in Czechoslovakia. I did not have direct contacts with the Soviet leadership, Mikhail Gorbachev and his group; it was simply impossible for me to have them. At that time I was under the strict control of our security bodies. You might not believe me if I tell you that in 20 years at least 55 public security corps members checked on me. Every day several people accompanied me from home to work and back. When my wife went to theater, to the hairdresser or to visit friends they accompanied her too but those were different people. We have three sons. They were under surveillance, too. When they grew up and married all their in-laws also became objects for observation. That was my life till 17 November 1990. On that day I was arrested for the last time. I would like to avoid the topic but that was what happened. A word from a song cannot be left out: I could not get away from this magic circle. Today it is fortunately all in the past and we should not think about it. In my view we should concentrate on the future instead.

[Chaykova] What were the problems about mutual relations between our countries which you talked about at the meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev in the Kremlin, and how long did the meeting last?

[Dubcek] Problems... As you know Soviet troops are still in Czechoslovakia. Naturally we spoke about it but in what context? As is known agreements about the dates of the withdrawal of the Soviet troops were reached before our meeting. I must admit that this schedule has been strictly followed. It is true that in Czechoslovakia funny rumors have been circulating about this problem. I think that they have been evoked by the slowing down or halting of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the GDR. However, that is quite a different matter. As you know it is connected with the fact that U.S. troops have been deployed on FRG territory and they have still not even considered withdrawing. We have no problems like that. Everything is going ahead as it should. Both sides even try to accelerate the withdrawal of Soviet troops from our country. Mikhail Gorbachev confirmed this at our meeting. Only the technical side of the problem must be looked into. The process itself, however, goes on as it should. My meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev went on for over one and a half hours. I think that the Soviet President gave me much time. I am grateful to him for that.

[Chaykova] What was your impression of Mikhail Gorbachev—a human being?

[Dubcek] The meeting with the Soviet president impressed me strongly. I was glad that we found each other. In our time we were declaring the slogan: socialism with human face. For me these were never just empty words. It is very important what sort of man is leading this or that state. What I saw in the eyes of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, his face, confirmed everything that I thought of him beforehand. I have found a human being in him. This is the most important thing. Naturally, I assess him as a politician too; one cannot be separated from the other. As a politician, he is close to me as a follower of humanism and democracy. I understand what a very complicated situation he is in. I felt it myself when in the spring of 1968 we tried to abolish the old and to build a new society. Not everyone liked it. Opponents, as is known, do not sleep. It must be also said that nobody in politics is insured against errors. Mikhail Gorbachev for me remains a great authority. I wish him success and I also wish success to Soviet restructuring. It is naturally of world importance. Maybe people might find these words too pathetic but it is true. Anyhow, leading officials in many countries say the same. We all expect the democratic trends to win in the USSR. Reversal would actually mean failure. However, I am an obdurate optimist and therefore I know that there are no problems which cannot be solved. The USSR is able to solve its problems, if not today then tomorrow. Time works for restructuring—this is what I believe.

[Chaykova] We still do not know who actually wrote the letter requesting the so-called international help to Czechoslovakia in August 1968; who sent it to Moscow, Berlin, Warsaw, Budapest and Sofia. What do you know about it?

[Dubcek] One document exists, signed first by the CSSR Government. It was published on the night between 21-22 August 1968. At that time the Presidium of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee was in session when the troops entered our country. We approved the following decision univocally: the government of the republic, the central committee of the CPCZ and our parliament and president firmly condemn the military interference in Czechoslovakia. We see this act as unlawful. The sovereignty of our country was violated unlawfully. However, then rumors started to spread about a letter signed by several people who invited this military help to our country allegedly to protect us against counterrevolution. We still do not know their names. It is also not known how many people actually signed this letter: 10, 15 or 20. Even if the letter was signed by 2,000 people the letter still would not have legal validity because only the state authorities and the government have the right to ask for aid in any form. So, I know almost nothing. A commission of CSFR and Soviet historians is being set up to try to clarify this problem. "More Light": That is a title of a Soviet documentary film I liked very much. I say, more light. We all need it, like air, like truth, like democracy.

Effects of Czechoslovak Price Hike Examined

PM2805133390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 May 90 Second Edition pp 1,7

[Dispatch Stanislav Vtorushin under the "Abroad. Correspondents Comment" rubric: "Even If Prices Are Rising..."]

[Text] Prague, 27 May—Czechoslovakia's Federative Government has announced that prices for all basic food products will rise as of 9 July this year. This increase will amount to 24.6 percent on average, and the total rise in prices will be 27 billion korunas. Increasing food prices is the first step toward a market economy, the transition to which has begun in the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federal Republic].

It must be said that this measure has not produced any special reaction within society. M. Calfa, chairman of the government, spoke of the need to switch to a market economy in a program statement last December. He said that his government was abandoning the experiment that aimed to create an economy based on combining principles whose compatibility had never been proved. The market must be accepted with all its merits and shortcomings. The latter, without doubt, include the inevitable price hikes. What brought this price hike about, and why is it so necessary?

Annual state food subsidies total 35 billion korunas. Agriculture is subsidized in all states. But whereas in a normal economy they are designed to stimulate production, in Czechoslovakia they were, on the contrary, a factor holding back the development of certain livestock and crop farming sectors. The price hike makes it advantageous to increase production of all types of agricultural produce. What is more, domestic food prices will be brought closer to world prices. This is of no small importance to Czechoslovakia which has set itself the aim of "returning to Europe." The country has already concluded treaties which allow its citizens to travel to a whole series of European states without visas, and this process is continuing.

But what impact will the price hike have on the population's standard of living? Virtually none. The people recover the entire price rise as compensation. The 27 billion korunas by which food prices have risen were divided by the number of the republic's population. Each inhabitant's share was 140 korunas. This sum will be repaid to every person each month as compensation.

It must be said that the price rise will not affect all products. This applies primarily to meat. The prices of the cheapest types of meat will remain unchanged.

The rise in food prices is the start of the reform of price formation in the country. Dates have already been announced for increases in the cost of travel on public transport and coal prices. At the same time, some things will become cheaper. For instance, prices of domestic electrical goods will be reduced by 25 percent.

Price hikes are an unpopular measure. But they have one aim—to create conditions for the normal functioning of the economy, increase production efficiency, and gain broader outlets for Czechoslovak goods on the world market. They are ultimately designed to stimulate production. Most of Czechoslovakia's population who support the governments' measures realize this.

Protocol Signed on Property in GDR

LD2705104690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0935 GMT 26 May 90

[Text] Berlin, 26 May (TASS)—From 23 to 25 May talks were held here between a delegation of Soviet experts led by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister E.Ye. Obminskiy and a delegation of GDR experts led by State Secretary of the GDR Foreign Ministry H. Domke on the legal protection of Soviet property interests in the GDR.

The sides signed a protocol defining the legal status of Soviet property in the GDR. It was stressed during the talks that reunification of the two German states must not be to the detriment of the economic interests of the USSR.

CPSU Greet Hungarian Socialists' Congress

PM2805100190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[CPSU Central Committee message "To Hungarian Socialist Party Congress"]

[Text] We send cordial greetings and wishes for success to the Hungarian Socialists' Congress.

We express the certainty that the collaboration between the CPSU and the Hungarian Socialist Party will continue to accord with the interests of good-neighborliness between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Hungary and peace and stability in Europe.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee.

Editor Comments on Hungary's Plans, Leaders

LD2505171290 Moscow International Service
in Hungarian 1900 GMT 24 May 90

[Commentary by editor Sergey Serikin on the formation of the new Hungarian Government; from the "Editor at the Microphone" program]

[Text] Good evening, dear listeners. Jozsef Antall outlined in parliament the basic principles of future Hungarian-Soviet relations. With the neighboring big power, the Soviet Union, we strive for balanced, correct, good-neighborly relations built on equality of rights, stressed the premier. Naturally, a statement that is as general as this requires explanation.

I think that the essence can be uncovered if we rely on the statement which was recently published in the press by Geza Jeszenszky, by now the foreign minister. In so

far as I have understood it, Geza Jeszenszky takes as his starting point that Hungary is a neighbor to a world power, for which reason there would be no sense in ruining relations. Apart from this, the conditions also exist for a substantial improvement in Soviet-Hungarian relations if these relations are built on an entirely voluntary basis. Geza Jeszenszky also observed that Hungary is interested in retaining the Soviet Union as a supplier of raw materials and energy providers, but not as the sole and dominant one, so that we might avoid economic dependence upon it.

I believe that such precepts are the result of not very successful considerations. Because they take it as their starting point that Hungary, with the help of the West—naturally keeping its full independence of it—must attain a determined, relatively high level of economic development. And in the meantime, the Soviet Union will purchase for convertible currency—precisely from Hungary—goods of which there is a plentiful selection on other markets as well. On the other hand, they will continue to ascribe to the Soviet Union some kind of undeveloped superpower role, which is not able to develop itself, which understands nothing about world market conditions, and which is even unable to distinguish between good quality goods from the mediocre.

Are these assumptions not utopian? Nevertheless, I do think that our economic cooperation will have to develop according to a different pattern. One could not philosophize a great deal about whether in the past our countries cooperated well or badly, although the final conclusion is clear: they could have been much more effective. So perhaps we should try to put things right today. All the more so because both for the Soviet Union and Hungary this represents a chance for a breakthrough toward the economy of the future. It is very difficult to do this. But it will be even more difficult to recommence building relations if today we thoughtlessly sever them and hand over their place to very big-toothed tigers.

In what do I see the motive of the harsh stance of a balanced politician like Geza Jeszenszky? I think that the new political forces, without realizing it, are paying homage to the past, even ideologizing the purely pragmatic procedures and intentions. This approach, in my opinion, expects to win itself adherents both at home and abroad. One example of this is the Antall government's attempt to see that the Soviet troops withdraw from Hungary before the recently signed deadline. This kind of statement can only be considered justified if the new government can resolve the technical problems of the withdrawal. Because it is the absence of precisely this and not of the political goodwill which dictates this relatively lengthy term of the Soviet troop withdrawals.

There is one more essential issue. Will the new Hungarian Government's intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact not have a negative effect on the development of Soviet-Hungarian relations? Presumably this is not first and foremost a bilateral problem, but a problem

of the security of Europe as a whole. This topic deserves particular attention, and we will come back to it.

Finally, I would like to express the hope that in the detailed elaboration of the government program, both the politicians and the experts will start out from realities, notably in the handling of the development of Soviet-Hungarian relations. Thank you for your attention.

SFRY's Jovic Thanks Gorbachev

PM2805095190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[Message from Borisav Jovic, president of the SFRY Presidency, "To USSR President Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Gorbachev,

I cordially thank you for your congratulations to me on the occasion of assuming the post of President of the SFRY Presidency.

I fully share your confidence that the traditionally friendly relations and all-around cooperation between our countries will continue to develop successfully.

With respect,

Doctor Borisav Jovic, president of the SFRY Presidency.

West Europe

FRG's Genscher on Cooperation With USSR

LD3005100590 Moscow TASS in English 0959 GMT
30 May 90

[Text] Bonn May 30 TASS—West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher called for broad and comprehensive cooperation between the West and the Soviet Union.

"President Gorbachev has opened his country to the West, to Europe," he told a meeting of the Free Democratic Party parliamentary faction in Bonn.

This calls for an answer. There can be only one answer: The Soviet Union must be drawn into any kind of political, economic, ecological and technological cooperation in Europe and throughout the world. Faced with the economic reform in the USSR, Genscher said, "the West must render that country extensive assistance. This includes a new approach to the Soviet Union's participation in international commercial and financial organisations."

According to Genscher, the CSCE summit meeting, scheduled for the end of the year, should lay the foundations for a transition to cooperative structures in Europe. Centres for preventing conflicts and protecting

the environment should be established within the framework of the CSCE process. The creation of market economy structures should also be encouraged within this framework.

Genscher Backing for Shevardnadze Proposals Cited

*PM2905181190 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 30 May 90 p 3*

[TASS report: "Genscher Call"]

[Text] Bonn, 29 May—FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher has called on the countries of the West to give economic support to the policy of reforms being pursued by President Gorbachev. It is essential to do this now, in the difficult period of perestroika, because its success in the Soviet Union—just as in the other East European countries—will be a victory for all Europe, the minister stated in an interview for Saarland radio. European security, he continued, is not a merely military concept. It also includes economic and political stability. Therefore it is essential to view all this in aggregate, by displaying the new thinking.

The head of the FRG's foreign policy department supported the proposals of USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze on the regular holding of summit-level CSCE meetings and conferences of the foreign ministers of the 35 states participating in this process, and also on creating an all-European center, based in Germany, for averting the danger of war. The essence of these proposals is also in line with our conceptions, Genscher emphasized. The CSCE process must become a kind of guarantee of European stability. All this will lead to a radical change in the situation in Europe and will strengthen faith in the continent's future. After noting the great importance for the future of Europe and German unification of progress in the reduction of conventional armed forces, the minister expressed the hope that it will be possible to secure decisive successes at the Vienna talks over the next few months.

Kulikov Comments on German Unity, Internal Order

*AU2805210790 Vienna Television Service
in German 2000 GMT 28 May 90*

[Interview with Soviet Marshal Viktor Kulikov by Georg Dox in Vienna on 28 May—recorded; Kulikov statements in Russian with superimposed German translation]

[Text] The German question was also discussed during Marshal Viktor Kulikov's visit to Vienna today:

[Begin recording] [Kulikov] The unification of the two Germanys is historically legitimate. The GDR has no motive for leaving the Warsaw Pact. The meetings between the GDR and Soviet defense ministers showed that the National People's Army is fulfilling its commitments. Now the view is taken that Germany as a whole could become part of the NATO sphere. The development is hard to predict. This is the affair of sovereign

states. However, haste and hurry are superfluous. Cautious actions have to be taken to avoid serious mistakes.

[Dox] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in a speech yesterday that the situation in the country is currently dangerous. How do you comment on this from the Army's point of view?

[Kulikov] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is thinking of the economic problems.

As regards the relations between the republics, the Baltic states, the Caucasus, and Moldavia—these processes were created by perestroika. Democracy and glasnost roused the people. Some republics exaggerate, their nationalist views are running away with them. However, a clear political dialogue, correct relations, and level-headedness should be victorious in the end.

[Dox] In the Baltic states, draftees gave back their paybooks. What is your view on these tendencies?

[Kulikov] I want to put it the other way round: In the Baltic states and in the Caucasus the young people are exactly aware that they have to serve in the armed forces as defenders of their homeland, who are not limited to their own four walls, as they say. As an army member, I can tell you that the necessary order is ensured in the armed forces. [end recording]

Shevardnadze on Austrian 'Permanent Neutrality'

*AU2905111490 Vienna Domestic Service in German
1000 GMT 29 May 90*

[Text] In the view of Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, Austria's neutrality is becoming particularly topical. In an interview for the magazine SOWJETUNION HEUTE, which is published by the Soviet Embassy in Vienna, he said that a decisive moment in history might come for the neutral and nonaligned states. In Shevardnadze's view, these states are increasingly gaining importance in the climate of disarmament. Shevardnadze thinks that Austria's active foreign policy on the basis of permanent neutrality is the reason for Austria's rising international reputation.

Turkish Parliamentary Delegation Pays Visit

*LD2905122290 Moscow TASS in English 1135 GMT
29 May 90*

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The desire of Soviet and Turkish peoples to be good neighbours was stressed by parliamentarians of the two countries at a meeting today between Ivan Laptev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and a delegation from Turkey's Grand National Assembly. The delegation is on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The guests familiarised themselves with the pace of reforms in various spheres of Soviet life, with the activity

of the new Soviet parliament, and the work of people's deputies in conditions of perestroika.

Intensifying Turkish-Soviet ties, including the two parliaments, meets the interests of the two states, said the head of the delegation, Y. Avci.

Avci, who is deputy chairman of the assembly, pointed to the great impact which profound changes in the USSR have on the course of world history and the great interest in them in Turkey.

Lukyanov Receives Parliamentarians

LD2905212790 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 29 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Soviet Parliament chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov received a delegation from Turkey's Grand National Assembly, led by deputy speaker Y. Avci, in the Kremlin today.

Lukyanov told the Turkish guests about the Soviet parliament activities aimed at switching over to a regulated market economy and establishing a law-governed state.

He drew the guests' attention to Soviet foreign policy steps aimed at averting the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, at resolving regional conflicts, at making headway in the all-European process and at solving global problems facing mankind.

For his part, Avci spoke of basic matters concerning the activities of the Turkish Parliament. People in Turkey, he said, follow the Soviet people's efforts to renew society and wish them success.

The two sides expressed satisfaction with the development of good-neighbourly Soviet-Turkish relations. They also emphasised the importance of further deepening contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and Turkey's Grand National Assembly in the interests of accomplishing specific tasks of inter-state cooperation and ensuring peaceful development, security and stability in the region and throughout the world.

On behalf of the Grand National Assembly, Avci invited a Soviet parliamentary delegation to visit Turkey. USSR people's deputy A.A. Rynka and Volkan Vural, the Turkish ambassador to the Soviet Union, took part in the conversation, which was held in a friendly atmosphere.

Future of Relations With Turkey 'Brilliant'

TA2605164390 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 1405 GMT 26 May 90

[Text] Moscow (A.A.)—Turkey's ambassador in Moscow, Volkan Vural, has said the ideological and military factors of strain between Turkey and the Soviet Union changed place recently with concern for cooperation aiming to serve the people and prosperity of both countries.

At a round table meeting organized Friday to commemorate the 70th anniversary on 3 June of the beginning of Turco-Soviet relations, both sides agreed that the future of relations was brilliant.

Soviet Foreign Ministry and Foreign Economic Relations Ministry officials and members of the USSR Academy of Sciences took part at the round table meeting organized by Soviet NOVOSTI agency.

Soviet Foreign Ministry Asian [as received] Department deputy Chief Vitaliy Nikiforov said the relations started by Lenin and Ataturk 70 years ago with their deep search for friendship and secure borders and secure neighborly relations still maintained validity.

Leonid Manjosin, Foreign Ministry Turkish desk chief [name and title as received], in his part said in their 500-year-old relations Turks and Russians fought each other for only 50 years.

USSR Academy of Sciences member Boris Potskhaveria [name and title as received] on the other hand said the dark period of relations during and after the World War II should be investigated by both Turkish and Soviet historians to end the distrust between the two countries.

A Turkish researchers association has been founded for this purpose to function within the framework of the USSR Academy of Sciences it was announced at the round table meeting.

Falin Meets Visiting Danish Communist Leader

LD2605172190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1510 GMT 25 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 25 May (TASS)—Valentin Falin, head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, met today with Ole Sohn, chairman of the Danish Communist Party.

In the course of the conversation an exchange of views took place on the prospects for cooperation between left-wing forces in Europe and the development of ties between the CPSU and the Danish Communist Party. Other questions of mutual interest were touched upon.

Latin America & Caribbean

PRAVDA Reports on 'Cuban Shield' Exercises

PM2205104790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[Reports by PRAVDA correspondent A. Moiseyev under the rubric "From the Scene of the Events": "The 'Cuban Shield' Is Firm: Threatening U.S. Actions Meet With Rebuff"]

[Text] Havana—The end of the biggest military maneuvers of recent years, which have been conducted throughout the country in the course of the last two weeks, has been announced in Cuba.

The exercises, which were given the name "Cuban Shield," were set in motion at the beginning of May in response to the large-scale U.S. wargames in the Caribbean. The Pentagon has undertaken a whole series of maneuvers in this region—"Global Shield," "Ocean Venture," and "Defex." Havana has regarded these actions as a direct threat to the republic's sovereignty.

The U.S. State Department in its turn has "rejected" the claims of the Cuban authorities that the U.S. Armed Forces are preparing an attack on the Island of Liberty. Washington has said the maneuvers are "routine," i.e., ordinary, "planned" exercises which do not threaten the sovereignty of its southern neighbor. In addition the White House has been quick to present the affair as if Havana were deliberately whipping up anti-American feelings and military passions in order to distract Cubans from their severe internal problems.

But however much the Pentagon generals call the maneuvers they are carrying out near Cuban shores "routine," they cannot fail to put on their guard even people who believe only faintly in the possibility of a U.S. intervention against the Cuban Republic. And taking into account the fact that the 82d U.S. Air Assault Division, well known for its participation in the aggressive actions against Grenada and Panama, took part in the wargames, it is difficult to refrain from the supposition that the Americans are rehearsing an attack on Cuba, not defense against it.

...In the first stage of the "Cuban Shield" exercises, which lasted several days, the citizens of Havana were awakened in the mornings by the dull thundering of artillery cannonades, and the rattling of rounds of automatic gunfire could be heard around the clock.

Traveling only a few kilometers from the capital I saw rocket launchers and the barrels of cannons and anti-aircraft machine guns on the shore aimed toward the sea. Detachments of militiamen from the people's militia and "defense and production" brigades set up enterprises joined with subunits of the regular army to carry out shooting practice and short-distance forced marches, dig trenches and ditches, and go "into the attack." Moreover, among the workers and employees in blue militiamen uniforms I noticed schoolchildren and very old men as well. Collaboration between the armed forces

and the civilian population was rehearsed in a near-combat situation. It has already been estimated that in all about 1 million militiamen of all ages and professions throughout the country participated in the maneuvers.

"I wish to state with full authority that Cuba is not preparing to annex the United States and add it to its territory as the fifteenth province," elderly Havana militiaman Jose Ramon Herrera told me, hiding a sly smile in his splendid mustaches. "We have quite a few problems of our own, which need to be solved urgently. And for this we need peace. We are the ones who are forced to see that our powder is dry. I respect the U.S. people, we could cooperate with them splendidly, but like any nation, mine responds in an appropriate manner to hostility."

My other collocutor—Libre Quintero Vera, the commander of a flight of fighter planes (he acquired combat experience in Angola)—told me about the participation of hundreds of modern aircraft in the U.S. maneuvers. "The provocative flights of U.S. planes near our borders create a real threat of 'an accident in the air,'" he explained. "And this, as you will agree, is fraught with serious consequences. Our task is not to allow these dangerous provocations."

It is possible to react in different ways to Cuban reality, but without losing an objective and sober view of events. Many of my foreign journalist colleagues in Havana, as far as I know, view the Cubans' passion for military maneuvers with a critical eye. However, even they reacted with understanding to the "Cuban Shield." After all, the U.S. aggression against tiny Panama 5 months ago is fresh in everyone's memory.

In the words of Fidel Castro, Cuba's position is: "It is better that we mobilize our forces 100 times superfluously than once weaken and allow ourselves to be caught unawares."

... The Pentagon maneuvers have now finished. And the "Cuban Shield" exercises, in the last phase of which only the regular units and subunits of the republic's revolutionary armed forces participated, ended straight after them. Even a few days ago to my question as to how much longer they will have to "make war," Cuban officers answered indefinitely, but firmly: "When the threat to our country lessens, then we'll decide. In any case, they must know on the other side of the Gulf of Florida that the 'Cuban Shield' remains firm."

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Carries 29 May Supreme Soviet Session

Session Opens, Laptev Chairs

LD2905175790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1604 GMT on 29 May begins carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 29 May at the Kremlin in Moscow. The morning session opens with Council of the Union Chairman Ivan Laptev in the chair.

Laptev asks the deputies to take their places and register: 397 are present. He says the government's report on the economy is to be the subject of discussion once again.

An unidentified deputy asks for apologies from the Supreme Soviet following earlier aspersions cast on his name. Laptev says the matter will be looked into.

At 1608 GMT Deputy Romanenko says that he has doubts about the proposed market. He refers to the lack of success achieved by the existing laws on the enterprise, leasing, etc., which were supposed to favor market development. Western nations have had decades in which to establish market conditions. Romanenko thinks that the market must arise naturally in the USSR; it must not be imposed by directive from above. He says there are also ecological considerations to take into account.

At 1615 GMT Deputy Sokolov from Kuybyshev says that Soviet industry currently manufactures many goods for which there is no demand. The free market will reverse this position. The information given out by the present administrative-command system cannot be believed: Only the market gives accurate indications of the real state of the economy—and it does not yet exist. He refers to the "shock therapy" which is said to be necessary, making the point that the shock must not be borne by the people. New ideas are required, and the Supreme Soviet should be discussing them. The problems are complex, but the ideal solutions will be simple.

At 1622 GMT Laptev refers to the Chinese experience of market conditions, in which the market's growth rate was too fast.

Deputy Lapygin says that perestroika has encountered considerable problems, which are adequately reflected by the consumer market. Gross national product is static, although monetary income has risen. The reasons for the adverse economic position must be sought urgently and consistently in a spirit of scientific enquiry. In the past, bonus funds were used to raise wages, not to boost output. This must not happen again. The new cooperatives are readily granted loans by the banks, but the results of this operation are "dubious," he asserts. What will the new market give us, anyway? Lapygin asks. There will certainly be unemployment, much of which

will be generated by the "conversion" program. In agriculture, "financial autonomy" often meant that state farms were kept going by additional payments from above, but they did not produce more meat as a result.

At 1635 GMT Deputy Kozyrev says that the economic questions are really a matter of saving the country. It must be borne in mind that the present "Civilized" economic systems of the West grew out of "mutual plunder." Crime is also a growing threat. The proposed government control of prices during the transition period, while there is a free circulation of materials, will encourage speculation. The government must urgently devise a program for resisting large-scale organized crime Kozyrev urges. Should the economic reform begin with price reform? Prices can, it is true, be regulated, but such tinkering will not fundamentally improve the underlying economic situation. He believes reform of more basic elements should precede price reform. Young people must also be involved in economic reform. At present, they have no say in their future whatsoever. All political forces must also be involved, he concludes.

Economic Reform Debate

LD2905193790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 29 May at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1647 GMT Deputy Sharonov says that people are currently confusing price rises with the advent of a free market. He surveys recent government attempts to influence the economy. The Soviet economy cannot be thrown into the market at the deep end: There is no water in the pool, no goods. The USSR Supreme Soviet is not being allowed enough time to debate the economy properly, Sharonov feels.

At 1656 GMT Deputy Kim says the Government program has taken into account many earlier proposals. The Inter-Regional Group is inconsistent in its criticism of the program. He thinks some administrative methods for regulating the market are necessary. The document submitted by the government is neither a concept nor a program because it lacks detailed elaboration. The moment for price rises is most unfavorable, compensation has not been thoroughly thought out.

Deputy Nazarov says living standards are falling, but mechanisms for transition to the market should take into account national specifics. He cites figures for Tajikistan showing that the republic's economy has hit bottom. More safety valves are required for the transitional period, monetary compensation is not sufficient. Nearly 27 percent of the local population are unemployed and more will join them following the proposed economic changes, Nazarov warns.

At 1715 GMT Deputy Prokushev says there is a split in perestroika: Democratization is moving ahead at full

speed while the economy is marking time. There is no other way to catch up but to introduce the market. Prokushev outlines areas which should be given special attention. A referendum on prices is vital he believes: Our laws do not work, but without them no market is possible.

At 1725 GMT Lukyanov is now chairing the session. Deputy Sazonov from the Social-Democratic Party speaks. He summarizes the laws which have been adopted to stimulate the market and points to their contradictory nature. Spiritual culture is lacking in the country, as a result there cannot be any thinktank because people are unable to think, having been brought up in this system. Sazonov contends the military is yet another brake on democracy. To make the program work, private property should be introduced. The issue of confidence in the government cannot be separated from confidence in the Supreme Soviet, he says in conclusion.

Deputy Chabanov, general director of the rotor science and production association, says he already works in conditions of market economy. He describes his professional experience and proposes various measures for softening the market blow. Prices should rise immediately, he contends, and state orders should be gradually decreased. Chabanov believes the program should be approved.

At 1745 GMT Lukyanov says there is a Turkish delegation in the hall, followed by applause to welcome the delegation.

At 1746 GMT Deputy Krasilnikov says price rises are unacceptable because enterprises are not yet independent. He thinks fixed prices have nothing to do with the market and that there is too much plan in the program. The program should be improved during the summer and price rises should be scrapped.

Deputy Desyatov gives an example of mismanagement: 500 million rubles were spent on a Yamal railroad which was later abandoned. He goes on to speak about some distorted elements of market economy as they exist in his town Komsomolsk-na-Amure which has a heavy concentration of defense industries. Monopolism in market conditions is absurd. The state order should be abolished. He proposes trying the market system in his town.

At 1759 GMT Lukyanov says that 84 deputies have spoken and 108 have asked for the floor. He reads notes asking to end the debate. Lukyanov calls for a vote on the question of whether to end the debate. Result: 241 for, 97 against, and 15 abstain. The debate ends and a break is announced.

Deputies Debate Reform Points

LD2905205590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 29 May at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1805 GMT the afternoon session begins with Lukyanov still in the chair. The debate remains on economic reform. Deputy Oleynik draws a distinction between freedom of choice and freedom of the market. He depicts the qualities needed for success in the market in a harsh light, stressing the elbowing aside of friends and relatives in the stampede for riches. He reads out a decision of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet about the transfer to a regulated market economy.

At 1814 GMT Deputy Bolbasov blames the absence of food and goods in the shops on the lack of interest in scientific and technical progress. He then gives a catalogue of inventors and inventions that have been ignored. There is little incentive for scientists to make advances. He contrasts this situation with the Chinese practice of giving material incentives to scientists who manage to improve production processes. We must certainly go into a market economy, he says, but we must be armed with science. Agreement with NATO must be attained so that the USSR's immense defense expenditure can be cut, and the money diverted into productive ends, he says.

At 1824 GMT Lukyanov says that 89 deputies have now spoken on the issue. He calls upon Deputy Doga to summarize briefly. The question, Doga says, is not whether to go over to a market economy, but how. It is not so important to draw up rules forbidding peasants from Ryazan to shop for food in Moscow; what is important is ensuring that there is sufficient food in Ryazan. It is also important to maintain traditional standards of morality in the face of market pressures he stresses.

Deputy Pavlov criticizes the lack of organization in parliamentary procedures: Only the strongest make it to the microphone!

At 1832 GMT Nikolay Ryzhkov is called upon to speak.

At 1913 GMT Lukyanov says that deputies have copies of all relevant documents. He mentions that a delegation of Polish Sejm deputies and senators is present in the hall. He then calls upon Deputy Boyko, deputy of the Committee for Economic Reform, to speak on behalf of the committee.

Deputy Boyko takes the deputies through the various draft decisions arising from the government's report on the transfer to a regulated market economy.

At 1930 GMT Lukyanov announces a two-hour break to end the afternoon session.

Evening Session Begins

LD2905223290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 29 May at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1932 GMT the evening session begins with Lukyanov in the chair. Deputies reregister. Lukyanov says the draft decision on the government report is to be considered. He says certain deputies raised the question of confidence in the government. Should we start debating this issue, Lukyanov asks? Voting on the proposal is postponed briefly as the computer is readied.

At 1940 GMT Deputy Kisin speaks in the meantime on the draft decision on the transition to the market suggesting some amendments.

At 1947 GMT the question on whether to debate confidence in the government is put to a vote. The proposal is rejected by 312 deputies.

Deputy Irgashev makes his contribution to amending the draft decision on the government document.

At 1952 GMT an unidentified deputy criticizes the way the government is dealing with prices. On the whole, he says, the document should be rejected because it has not had a positive response from the people.

Deputy Safarov discusses the problem of Central Asian cotton prices in the context of the impending price rises and suggests corresponding amendments.

Deputy Zelinskiy refers to the Ukrainian decision not to raise prices and suggests that other republics should also be consulted on the issue. The USSR president should be invited to speak at the session on this issue, Zelinskiy suggests.

At 2008 GMT Deputy Salykov says the document could be taken as a basis, while clarifications should be given in the media explaining the economic program.

Deputy Boldyrev criticizes price rises and the way debate was structured at the session. The issues of prices and the market should be examined separately as they are not directly interrelated. A month ago a request was sent to Ryzhkov about the need to publish financial statistics but the request has been ignored, Boldyrev states. Consequently, the Economic Reform Commission does not know the necessary statistics. He suggests more amendments.

At 2016 GMT Deputy (?Zakirov) argues for more compensation to Central Asian republics.

Deputy Filshin suggests further amendments and comments on the much longer time available to U.S. congressmen to process legal enactments.

At 2023 GMT Deputy Kirillov suggests a change in the wording of the draft decision.

Deputy Ryabchenko says that the state of the education system acts as a brake on economic progress. He suggests that there should be a national system of economic training, available to all.

At 2029 GMT Deputy Bolbasov says that the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet must consider the status of intellectual property in light of the transfer to a market economy.

Deputy Tsyplyayev points to one or two inconsistencies in the Supreme Soviet's approach to problems. The powers of the USSR Government and the RSFSR Government must be carefully specified, he says. Voting something into being is not a panacea for all ills.

At 2035 GMT Deputy Prokushev draws attention to the ultimate aim, extending beyond the transitional period—the creation of a union-wide market. He proposes changes in wording to incorporate this aim and also to cater for budget deficits, price reforms (to bring them into line with world prices), free enterprise, pluralism of forms of ownership, and social compensation for price rises.

Deputy Tsyurupa says that laws on noncommercial organizations and on medical insurance should be given priority in the near future.

At 2047 GMT Deputy Andreyeva proposes that consideration should be given to the plight of retirees, especially those with pensions below the minimum level. Their pensions could be raised by giving less to the well-off, she suggests. She also raises some editorial points.

Ryzhkov Urges More Work

LD2905230390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 29 May at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 2052 GMT Deputy Krayko says that a vote on the draft decision today would achieve nothing other than to show the deputies' lack of preparation for the task at hand. He proposes an increase in compensation for the rise in bread prices payable to those people which are particularly dependent on grain products; anti-inflation protection for those with deposits in state savings banks and acceptance of responsibility for price rises by those bodies involved in economic matters.

Deputy Ogarok says that the Supreme Soviet must pass judgment on the government's report, saying that it is heading in the right direction. Specialists must carefully chart the USSR's economic future. Discipline and a sense of responsibility must be inculcated into the workforce if any progress is to be possible, he points out.

At 2101 GMT Deputy Stepanov talks about the price of bread and the need to resurrect the countryside.

At 2104 GMT Lukyanov says 30 people have spoken.

At 2105 GMT Ryzhkov takes the floor. He says he is saddened by Lisitskiy's flippant speech (which does not appear in this recording) because he did not show enough respect for the government.

The question under discussion is hard for everyone, Ryzhkov says. It is the result of three months of work. Of course, four days is too short for covering it from every side. Ryzhkov suggests not making any decisions today. Let commissions and committees do more work on this document because the views are widely diverging, he says. Only the most essential laws should be adopted urgently, the others, which have been suggested today, can wait, in his opinion. Concerning governmental reporting, this process is taking place de facto. Otherwise, a specific procedure has to be established once and for all. Let us think for yet another week and then return to the draft decision, Ryzhkov says in conclusion.

At 2114 GMT Lukyanov says that there other proposals to this effect: to elaborate the document within a week. Everybody agrees to this proposal without voting.

At 2116 GMT Lukyanov outlines tomorrow's agenda, which features separate sittings in the Chambers. The day after tomorrow the outstanding drafts should be completed. The president's speech is scheduled for 6 June, Lukyanov says before closing the day's session at 2119 GMT.

Ryzhkov Summarizes Economic Debate

*LD2905135790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1100 GMT 29 May 90*

[Speech by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the Supreme Soviet Session at the Kremlin on 29 May; introduced by correspondent Marina Novitskaya—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Novitskaya] The debate on the government's report about the country's economic situation and the concept for transition to a regulated market economy ended today. [passage omitted] I think in conclusion one can say that for the most part, the majority of deputies are in solidarity that only a transition to market relations will make it possible to extract our economy from the crisis in which it finds itself. The dispute was mainly about the rate and the stages of the transition, and the choice of ways that will permit this to be done with the fewest losses. This was noted by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, who spoke at the end of the afternoon session. You will hear him in a couple of minutes, but first of all, I would like to say that the deputies were presented with a draft resolution on this issue. It was presented on behalf of the Supreme Soviet Committee on Economic Reform by Aleksey Nikolayevich Boyko. [passage omitted]

Now here is what Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov said in his summary.

[Begin Ryzhkov recording] Esteemed comrades! First of all, on behalf of the government, may I thank all those who have taken part in the discussion of the concept that has been presented concerning the proposals and remarks that have been submitted. Taking into account the complexity and the extreme importance of the problems of the transition to a market economy, which have been discussed so acutely and committedly at the session, over something more than three days, I would like, in my summary, to dwell on just the most fundamental points, on which, as shown by the many speeches and the questions passed to me, there are certain unclear aspects, and more detail is required in some cases, while in other cases, further explanation is required. It is also necessary to do this, evidently, because on the key issues that we have to resolve in the process of transition to the regulated market economy, the discussion has developed not in this hall alone, discussion has developed virtually throughout the country. Naturally, opinions here are not uniform, the spread of them is very considerable, and we must, in further work on the document, take maximum account of everything that is acceptable and everything that can give us help in this very difficult work. At the same time, on a number of points, evidently there is a need for some further discussion.

What, then, is in my view the main conclusion that can be drawn from everything that has been said in these days at the Supreme Soviet session? In brief, it consists of the fact that on the question of transition to the market, a virtually unanimous opinion has become clear. It is necessary, and there is no other alternative, and, as far as I understand it, that is our common opinion. At least, I have not heard other ideas. As far as the paths to the formation of a market economy are concerned, and the creation of the necessary preconditions for this, then here there are serious differences. Speaking honestly, I am not dramatizing things very much, it would evidently be quite naive to think that in a question such as that which we are discussing, there would be a unanimous opinion, that we would be agreed on everything. This is not a question which one could have an easy discussion about. Directly opposed opinions are expressed about the timetable for transition to the market and about the length of the period of its establishment.

The government is reproached for taking a small and timid step—I am quoting here—that we should proceed far more quickly. What is more, to judge from this kind of utterance, these proposals are also dictated by good intentions. In this respect, I would like once again to stress, on behalf of the government, that we cannot agree to ill-considered actions and unjustified risk. After all, the country is in many ways unprepared for a forced transition to the market, and social consciousness is also unprepared, something we have spoken about on many occasions in the last few days.

Therefore, we are for the balanced option. After all, it is wrong to experiment to the extent of tossing 290 million people into the turbulent waters of the market without creating the necessary preconditions. The option of, figuratively speaking, throwing [people] in at the deep end, is unsuitable here. The seriousness of intentions should be accompanied by equally serious, comprehensive, and regulated actions. We should not lapse into economic romanticism, but we are obliged not to forget about recent implementations of libertarianism.

Certain deputies, publicists, and representatives of science are making claims to the effect that we, allegedly, wish to carry out the transition to a market at the people's expense, placing on it the entire burden and whole loss connected with such a step. However, from the outset—and this is the main thing—one should ask oneself the question: Is it possible to radically transform the economic system and economic relations and how are we going to do this without any very complex and negative manifestations? Without a certain slump in production, without the risk of some reduction in the real incomes of certain strata of the population? Of course, if one is guided only by the desire, at least temporarily, to get people on your side, by promising them painless reforms that promise them rapid results tomorrow, then one can answer these questions in the affirmative. However, the government cannot go along with this untruth, to put it mildly. This has all happened already in our history: The inclination to put across what is desired as reality; and the belief in the omnipotence of promises and, as a consequence, destroyed hopes.

The harsh experience of failures compels us to be sober realists, to demonstrate responsibility and sensible circumspection in policy, and to proceed from the possibility of the unfavorable development of events so as to make provision for the necessary stabilizing measures for such an eventuality. I think you will agree that this stance is correct. The government is very well aware that it is not simple to say honestly to the people that hard times are ahead if we truly want to come out of the crisis, out of the situation in which we have been for a very long time. It is easier to say pleasant things, but I think that few people today are going to believe in abundance just around the corner, no matter what the source and no matter who proclaims it.

Of course, the government could also lose in the eyes of public opinion while telling the truth. I am, however, profoundly convinced that we are obliged to use all our might to ensure that that truth reaches all our citizens so that the understanding of the need for such a step penetrates to them.

The government indicated the great scale and complexity of the changes to come in the economy in its report. However, the debates primarily developed around those issues that have a direct impact on the vital interests of Soviet people. These are a balanced consumer market and the correlation of the population's incomes with regard to pricing policies. I think it is

essential that I pause once again on the essence of these problems despite the fact that they are given particular attention in the report and that I even felt that people were saying that the report has been made with a bias in that direction. I think it is right that there has been a bias in that direction. If we had fudged on this issue and not given our position honestly, people still would not have understood us. People would say: Why is the government adopting a position we can't understand? There's something being kept hidden here. We must also examine the roots of this matter. Of course, the main route is to saturate the consumer market and increase production of goods and services. We have aspired to this for many years but have been unable to get results or overcome the constant shortages. The question is asked: Why? After all, that's the main question and we have to answer the main question. Is it really a matter of two years? It's a matter of decades and we have to look at the roots, the roots of this matter. Why have we been unable to solve this matter for decades? Why have we had shortages for decades? Why have we had lines for decades? And everything that follows from this? The answer is simple. We have not created a system for strongly motivating highly productive labor and an accompanying increase in production with the aim of meeting the demands of the consumer market. Boris Ilyich, who spoke before I did, spoke about this, as a poet and a writer, very graphically. It's hard for me to convey what he was able to do with his poetic language. The root of the evil is evidently there and if we do not find genuine elements of motivation, if we do not create such a system, a new system, whether the one we are proposing or perhaps a better one that someone might put forward, we will remain at the level we have been on. We must understand this. However hard it is for us to talk about this today, I do understand that while the government may be getting more criticism than anyone else in the country today, we are telling the truth. If we stick to the old positions, well, we'd still have to make such decisions and acknowledge the results of them and not then reproach ourselves for the fact that there was no movement forward.

With the transition to market relations, we must create economic conditions that ensure the speedy development of an effective motivating mechanism. With the existing deformed system of price setting it is, comrades, impossible to do this. I understand that I am again saying unpopular things. I know that I will be criticized for this. But I firmly stand up for the idea that it is permissible to look into whether it should be these prices or other prices. Let us consider but not change the price setting system. When the most dreadful distortions have occurred in our country, is it really possible to think about some kind of economic or socioeconomic movement forward, or about the creation of some kind of economic mechanism that would enhance the effectiveness of our production? Evidently many people remember when we intended in 1988 to carry out a price reform, this is well-known, public opinion opposed it. A

number of scientists supported them at that time, incidentally, those scientists who for two years, one and one-half years before this had said that this was an essential prerequisite for the transition to new economic relations. We did not demonstrate the necessary firmness either and I say this self-critically. It was decided to postpone the implementation of this measure and to find a method for balancing the growth in the population's income and expenditure of the population. However, it must be admitted that we were not successful in achieving this. And believe me, it is not just a matter of our indecisiveness—of which the government is often accused. There are objective difficulties that did not permit the growth in income to be held back and the suitable levers for this to be found. All of this, you see, comrades, the excessive growth in income, began at that time when we switched industry over to new management methods in 1988 and 1989. I told you in my report and I would like to recall these figures once again: Over two years, the growth in the population's income, that is over those two years when we switched to new management methods, the population's income rose by R105 billion or by 23 percent. Such a volume of income growth occurred previously over a period of seven years, from 1981 to 1987. That, as they say, is the picture. I would like to recall a number of examples from the fairly recent past: The attempt made in September last year, in this hall incidentally, to use for this a progressive tax on the growth of earnings as you may remember, got a very poor reception in the country and did not bring about the desired results, at all. Moreover, alongside a fall in the production of income, that is alongside a fall in production, income this year, as is already well-known, increased during these months, during four months by 14 percent.

In a normal economy, there must not be such a money flow without the goods to back it up. If production does not grow and efficiency marks time, there must not be a growth in income either. Otherwise it is impossible to balance the market. It is bound to fall into confusion, shortages will worsen. The result is growing social tension. The situation is an extreme one. It shows that solving the problem without changing prices, only by freezing incomes... [Ryzhkov changes thought] and this is an alternative: to stop at where we are today, to freeze all incomes, not to raise wages for anyone by a single kopeck, not for pensioners, not for students, not for workers. There is such an alternative. But we consider that that is where economic reform would end. In our opinion, we shall not manage either to tie the money supply by other means, or only to increase production and services.

This conclusion rests on objective economic laws, and they cannot be cheated. And if we seriously intend to embark on the market, we must not go on trying to manage the economy against these laws. It is an unpleasant fact, but we cannot ignore it.

We are putting forward unpopular measures, and naturally they do not arouse enthusiasm. But we must be

honest to the end. Some scholars and specialists have, in my view, adopted very comfortable positions, stating that we need to change to a market system, but without changing retail prices, they say. What is this? A failure to understand? Hardly. In one and the same article, the author says that a single price rise is a shock without therapy, but at the same time he preaches free prices—and doesn't back himself up with any medical terminology.

We must not deceive either ourselves, or people. It is pointless to embark on market relations with the current state of pricing policy. I am not talking of price levels, comrades. We can, and must, speak of this, we must calculate it. But on a level of principle, that's to say, if we consider that we can do it in such a way, I believe that that would be a very great mistake. To avoid a step like the reform of price formation now, means making the problem more difficult. It is sufficient to say that in 1988, that's to say the year when we should have taken that step, we spoke of reconsidering prices to the tune of about R100 billion. Those are the figures, those are the calculations. Today we need to speak of about R200 billion. If it goes on like this, then the figure will rise to R300 billion or to R400 billion.

Comrades, practically every speech touched, to some degree or another, on the question of what changes the policy of retail prices should undergo. Two approaches came out particularly clearly here. One, as I have already said, is free prices, and the second is simultaneous revision of them, with the relevant compensation for them.

I would like to say once again, comrades, to confirm the government's position: We are not prepared to embark upon the first version. We are not prepared to, and as I have, as they say, expressed my position on this firmly now and it was said in the report. The second version does, at least, permit a forecast of the situation and the implementation of an effective system of measures to protect the population from the increasing cost of living. For this reason, the government spoke in favor of this. In our opinion, it could be taken as the basis for further work.

I will say a few words about compensation payments. I have already given figures that attest to the fact that between 1987 and 1990, the growth of the population's currency income was about R200 billion in excess of their expenditures. On the first occasion I only gave the figures for two years, on this occasion for longer. This money was not distributed equally among the various sections of the population. The greater proportion went to workers in enterprises in a number of the industries of the national economy where the growth in salaries can be seen to be in excess of that in the volume of output, to cooperative workers, and to the staff of many scientific research institutions and planning organizations. Pensioners and people with a low fixed income either gained very little or the level of the money paid them remained the same.

Comrades, I see the criticism and will go on to say a few words about scientific and technical progress. Yes, indeed, in our written report we gave this greater attention. In the oral report, this topic was not extensively developed. I have, however, always been in favor of scientific and technical progress and believe it is the engine for our advance along with economic mechanisms. However, I do have a question as to why a situation has come about in which, in 1988 and 1989, when we provided the opportunity, created a new economic mechanism for our scientific research and planning institutes so that they really would consider their output, so to speak, a commodity and from this gain, as they say, a degree of remuneration, why a situation has come about in which we are shouting from this rostrum today that we have fallen behind in scientific and technical progress. We say it bitterly and look the other way, to the West, and say that there is scientific and technical progress there. One then asks the question as to why in those two years, salaries at institutes have grown by 40 percent. And evidently you know the figures we cited when discussing specific issues at the Presidium of the Council of Ministers, when the directors of these institutes were getting 90 salaries a year. [calls from the hall, including "there were no controls"] There were no controls? But didn't they have a conscience?

Where is the scientific and technical progress? Where are those salaries—and not only of the builders? Actually, the example I gave of 90 salaries, is not at a Building Institute, but an Oil Workers' Institute. Comrades, we have tried to construct the compensation system in such a way as to remove injustice in allocations which could arise here. This means that the badly off, those whom we are obliged to protect first, will be in the best position. The main share of the losses under price rises must particularly fall to those whose incomes have recently risen.

Now to money reform. Several deputies spoke of this. This problem is discussed often and widely in the press. The government has many times put forward its opinion on the question. I will repeat our conclusions yet again, although I know that the reaction in society to this proposal is not homogenous.

The popularity of monetary reform which the majority imagine in its regressive alternative—that is to say, part of the money has to be taken in—rests on the idea that it will make it possible to take money from the rich, from those who earned it dishonorably, while labor income will not be touched. We have analyzed in detail the consequences of the implementation of this measure, and come to the conclusion that in fact, the fat cats of the shadow economy would suffer least of all from monetary reform. They do not keep their money in large deposits in the savings bank, but try to turn them as fast as possible into material valuables and have more chance than anyone to do this. Furthermore, calculations show that if, as a result of the reforms, we are to cut to any extent the significant money supply—which is what the authors of this proposal are counting on, as they say—we

need to demand a declaration, and introduce a lowering of the exchange rate [propoatsiya obmena] from deposits of not more than R1,000. This means that the interests of the majority of honest workers will be affected, genuine savings from their labor. In my opinion, we must not go down this path.

After all, today this money is invested in savings banks, and in fact is withdrawn from circulation. We are obliged to value the confidence of the population in the state and its savings banks particularly. To subvert this means pushing people into removing their deposits and flinging them into the consumer market which is already disrupted to the limit. A rational policy must be aimed at stimulating savings as much as possible, at raising interest on deposits to that end. We are now concerned not to permit the devaluation of deposits in connection with price rises. I want to take this occasion to assure Soviet citizens, on behalf of the government, that their savings placed in the savings bank will be protected by us, and special protection measures are being worked out to that end.

Now, permit me to touch on questions that were submitted during the discussion of the government plan. It would, apparently, be a good idea to group them according to the nature of the problems on which they touch. Naturally, the majority of questions concern the most complex topic, including in the socioeconomic sense, of providing the population with reliable social protection from cost of living increases. Questions relating in one way or another to this problem have come from People's Deputies Larionov, Mikheyev, Osipov, Zubkov, Kublashvili, Zhigunova, Kamenshchikova, and many others. They express concern about the reliability of the mechanism of compensatory measures and about consideration for the interests of individual groups: women with young children, pensioners, residents of the regions of Siberia and the Far East, and workers of state enterprises. I have already spoken about the overall approaches to the elaboration of the proposed system of compensatory measures. Now let me speak specifically on the questions posed by people's deputies.

The government has thoroughly analyzed all the possible options for carrying out compensatory measures. When determining the approaches to their formation, the main thing was to choose a general principle on the basis of which the most socially fair system of compensation could be created. We determined and proposed such a principle. It comprises the combination of the requirement for the immediate and maximum support for the less well-off strata of the population and consideration of the real contribution of each worker to social production. Only such a precisely adjusted, and thoroughly considered approach can, in our view, ensure the people's confidence in the reform being implemented and ensure social harmony in society.

A number of deputies have asked the question: Where will the money come from to pay compensation at financially autonomous enterprises? This issue has also

been addressed from this rostrum. In all cases, the source of compensation is the same: state budget resources. To avoid transferring money from one account to another it is, evidently, expedient for financially autonomous enterprises to initially pay these sums out of their own incomes and, subsequently, to take them into consideration when settling accounts with the budget, correspondingly reducing the sum of taxes paid. The proposal presented by the government speaks of this. At the same time, enterprises have the right to allocate additional means from their income to increase compensation, for example, to make additional payments in connection with the increased price of passenger transport—another question that was raised here quite sharply.

You will understand that it is impossible just now for me to describe all the nuances of the compensation system applicable to every social, demographic, and professional group of the population. But if the government's proposals on the nationwide discussion of the draft of retail price reform and the compensation of the population for losses relating to it are supported, then the material submitted for public appraisal will, undoubtedly also present data, prepared during the elaboration of the ideas, which specify in greater detail the compensation measures with regard to individual groups of the population.

At the same time, I cannot fail to touch on in detail those measures proposed by the government to make compensatory payments for the rising price of bread and bread products, of course, if this decision is adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Comrades, I will not touch on the motivation behind this proposal. Enough was said about this in the report. I have expressed my view in an interview and have expressed it several times, as they say, in various conversations. And Mikhail Sergeyevich said the same thing on Sunday.

I shall remind you that in this case, if the decision is adopted, the population's additional spending on purchases of bread and bread products in the second half of 1990 will constitute R17.5 billion. This, as they say, is the whole range of the bread products. This sum, I am stressing this again, will be fully refunded to the population. How do we suggest this should be done? According to calculations, from the moment the new retail prices for bread and bread products are introduced a compensation will be paid. I would like to report to you the government calculation. The workers, office workers, collective farm workers, and other categories of the population will receive R13 a month. The pensioners, nine rubles 50 kopeks. The full-time young students in the institutions of higher education, secondary technical and vocational institutions, R13. Children under five years, five rubles 50 kopeks. From six to 12 years, R7; from 13 to 17 years, R10. All this is per month. The dependents will receive half the compensation of the employed. For example, a family of four with both parents working and two children will receive a compensation slightly higher than R40 a month.

Significant attention at the session was paid to the taxation of enterprise profits. And I would like to address this question, nevertheless, even though there were already extremely heated discussions. First of all, the proposed level of tax rates, which is directed, among other things, against monopolies is being put in doubt. What can one say about this? First of all, by introducing the 55 percent tax on profits, we base ourselves on the realities of economics and those tasks that need to be solved at the Union and republic levels. Comrades, in general, we can opt for a lower tax. We can. But at the same time, we should soberly assess our possibilities of realizing the special industrial, ecological, and other programs including, by the way, those being adopted by the Supreme Soviet. So, here we need an especially correct analysis. Before making a final decision, and also to bring some clarity to this matter, let us calculate together. This question cannot be simply decided by vote. Very sober, serious calculation is needed. Second, about the maximum level of profitability. What has been suggested about its limitation is a defensive measure. I am stressing this, comrades—precisely a defensive measure which guards the consumer against the dictates of monopolism. I often ask myself the question: Who, in general, is against the 30 percent ceiling? Each time I ask—is it the consumer who is against, or is it the producer? And I have made an analysis that in general, it is the producer who is against. But the consumer takes a very passive role in this case. We, the government, are trying to protect the consumer. They start, as they say, to criticize us here: Why are you doing this?

One cannot ignore realities, comrades. It is impossible to overcome monopolization in a single day and he who intends to destroy all of our monopoly companies overnight, in one moon [mesyats], as they say, is being unrealistic. At the same time there should be a system which envisages exception from this rule when an enterprise, not by raising prices, but by scientific and technological achievements, achieves greater efficiency. It is better for us to make exceptions from the rules than to make rules which will lead to the start of an irrepressible price increase.

There have been many questions about foreign economic ties, the hard currency situation in the country as a whole, and individual enterprises; mutual relations within the framework of CEMA, and also with developing countries; the convertibility of the ruble. People's Deputies Kisin, Bavula, Ostroukhov, Nuzhnyy and a number of others have addressed such questions. They were raised in the speeches by Comrades Filshin and Sharipov. The questions that have come from people's deputies concentrate mainly on problems of effectiveness in our foreign economic ties, especially in mutual relations with countries where until just recently the determining factor was to a significant degree the political component. I talked about this in the report and must stress once more that the USSR's mutual relations with partners abroad are being decisively shifted to a strictly commercial basis.

These are the necessary conditions for the country's normal development. I want to stress once again that we have raised the question of all our interrelations with the CEMA member countries being based only on world prices and on accounting in freely convertible currency from 1 January 1991 onward. This is a very major step, but it is one we must take.

Deputy Chekoyev touches on the subject of regional differences in connection with the transfer to market relations and Comrades Tukhtabayev and (?Ordzina) raise the question of interrelations between the Union and the union republics in the conditions of a market economy.

The government's report spoke of the need to take into account the level of development of individual republics and the differences in the starting conditions of the changeover to market relations. It goes without saying that a mechanism of assistance to those republics which, for objective reasons, have been lagging behind in their development must be set up. The government believes that an interrepublican development fund could become the chief element of such a mechanism. However, it stands to reason that a decision in this respect can be taken with the agreement of all union republics. I regard as fully justified the remark by people's deputies to the effect that the problems which arise for the autonomous entities in connection with the changeover to market conditions have been insufficiently reflected in the report. The questions raised are indisputably very serious and require a further detailed study from the government of the country and the union republics.

This also pertains to social support for the small populations of the north and the far east. The sharpness with which the issue was raised to the effect that the government's concept and report apportion impermissibly little attention to the development of culture and the difficulties it may run into in market conditions is no accident. I will frankly admit that the speech by USSR People's Deputy David Nikitich Kugultinov made a strong impression on me. It was all permeated by a profound philosophical sense, the essence of which is: While dealing with economic and material problems, we should not inadvertently push culture into the background, since no economic mechanism will be of help here. In a word, the issue of developing culture, education, and health care should undoubtedly find their due places in the forthcoming economic transformations. A good deal has been said to the government about scientific and technical progress and the lack of proper adjustment of economic levers in this sphere. All this should be taken into account when the document is being further improved and incentives should be created which will, indeed, as the saying goes, advance scientific and technical progress.

Comrades, after all, we all know it does not matter how many good plans we adopted, large or small, when we proclaimed how to run scientific and technical progress; we are still generally dissatisfied with the nationwide

state of affairs in this area. If in the defense industries, where there was a very rigid centralized control, we achieved certain successes and maintained our arms at the proper level, then we did not manage to achieve it in the national economy as a whole. The essence of a new economic mechanism lies in the fact that the work should be carried out not by diktat, not with the help of our description of this or that technology, this or that construction of a machine. We ought to justify and create the competition, which has to become the driving force; competition should become the driving force. Then we would not need numerous plans; life itself would make us deal with scientific and technical progress, including inventing, which was mentioned by the previous orator.

Now I will mention one more question of principle. It concerns the system of management of the national economy in connection with the transition to a regulated market economy. I have to tell you about this. Statements are being made, saying that if the existing structure, which was approved by the Supreme Soviet 10 months ago, is being preserved, the effective transition to the market economy is not going to be possible. It looks as if in my report I did not manage to prove convincingly that now when we are starting such massive reorganization, it is extremely dangerous to ruin the existing system of management at the same time.

How we should make use of the possibilities of the transformation of this system is another matter. It must, to the greatest extent possible, be involved in the market economy. Experience shows that the principle of destruction is not always the best or most correct way. Of course, in one or two years' time the current management system will look entirely different and it is our task to achieve this in our practical work. Comrades, what has now been put to society's judgment breaks down a concept of the country's social and economic life that has developed over years. A new understanding of that life is required, and that takes time. It will not be possible to get through this period of preparing the population for the new conditions just like that. I must say time and time again that the switch to a market economy is possible only with the consolidation of the efforts of the people as a whole and with their active support. We will genuinely have to hold discussions with the entire population on this complex but absolutely necessary step of transforming the economy, which affects the way of life and the destiny not only of the present generation but of future generations as well. We do not know the result of the people's expression of will in advance, and it stands to reason that we will act as the people themselves say. I have to say, however, on behalf of the government of the country, and to call on everyone at this complex time to think seriously about their actions and carefully consider what they do—this includes, incidentally, the fact that they should not yield to panic and buy up everything, which will then become spoiled and turn out not to be needed by anyone, depleting our already meager market of reserves. I would like to draw everyone's attention

again to both sides of the problem. One gets the impression that many people hear only the fact that prices must be raised but, for the moment, too few are aware that the state will do all it can to lessen these difficulties and secure the Soviet people against them as much as possible. So serious trials are ahead for us all and it will be possible to withstand it successfully only if we are united and convinced of the correctness of our chosen path and if we are not accompanied from our first steps by panic and confusion. Look soberly at the situation that has developed, weigh everything thoughtfully both for and against, organize advice that will really come from all the people in order to make this decision, and only then move on to implementing it. That's what I would like to urge on all the citizens of our country.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the government does not intend in any way to transfer its own responsibility for implementing the program of transferring to a regulated market economy to anyone else. Moreover, we are firmly convinced of the need to make a clear distinction between the remit of executive and administrative power. It is for precisely this reason that the government must have the chance to act decisively and firmly within the limits of the rights it has been granted. At the same time, the importance of the issue we have devoted the last few days to discussing, its truly historical nature, and the need for a general consensus to implement the chosen strategy of switching to the market makes close cooperation between the government and parliament absolutely essential.

We are counting on the active work of the committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, jointly with representatives of the government, on deepening and improving the concept. We are also counting, comrades, on the support of our whole people. I thank you for your attention. [end recording]

Further Ryzhkov Remarks

LD3005002890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2105 GMT 29 May 90

[Remarks by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the 29 May Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] [Ryzhkov] Esteemed comrades! I have asked to come onto the rostrum once again because one feels that it is a complex question and perhaps it calls for very serious thought once again. First of all, I would like, perhaps, well, not as Chairman of the Council of Ministers, but just as a person, to say that I have always been used to talking in the proper way with no matter whom. I consider that that is a normal phenomenon. In my opinion, that ought to be the norm in parliamentary disputes, discussions, and debates. Therefore, we should have respect for each other, including for the government, which you appointed 10 months ago. I have been very distressed today by the so very reckless [besshabashny] speech unleashed by Comrade Lisitskiy. Honestly speaking, I once held his post, but, well, to make the

comparison as though the chairman of the Council of Ministers, the government, were to be called to account like a workshop foreman, well, I think that is a great impropriety on his part. Let it be on his conscience. Incidentally, I have been a workshop foreman, and I have held your post. But I never spoke to my workshop foreman as you are speaking to the prime minister of the country. [indistinct voices in hall] Well, God forbid! The heart of the matter. I do not.... [changes thought] Maybe it wasn't worth my talking about that but I, well, I see that such trends are beginning... [changes thought] to speak in an offhand manner, in an offhand manner to the government. One should not, should not work like that. One gets the feeling that the government is like a hobbled steed whose legs have been bound and which everybody then urges on.

Well, just put yourselves in such a situation, and you will find out what it is like to work.

With regard to the question under discussion—the draft decision on the reform. I understand that decision. The question is so complex. It is complex for us all. You think that it has been easy for the government. We discussed these questions for three months. I have already said it has passed through thousands of people, through their brains, through thousands of thoughts, and I do not know if what we submitted is good or bad, but I know that we submitted a difficult question. I know that. But there are no easy questions today.

Therefore, I appreciate that the four days that we have spent here discussing that problem, they are obviously insufficient. They are sufficient to express one's opinion, well, you see, Anatoliy Ivanovich [Lukyanov] says that a hundred people have already spoken. Well, therefore, I would make the following proposal, Anatoliy Ivanovich. Perhaps a decision should really not be made today, all the more so since there are a great many proposals, and in my opinion, well, playing it by ear, of course, many of the proposals are constructive. So, they've got to be worked on properly, well, one has to write, try to analyze, and perhaps give the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet, with the participation of representatives of the government, the opportunity to work on this draft for a few days and then present it once again for discussion.

Perhaps then we will find some points of contact, and perhaps we also will find really correct solutions. I would submit the following proposal: That we should not adopt this draft just like that, straight off, today because one is aware of very large areas of disagreement. Second, I have a second request; comrades, we mentioned in the draft decision—we mentioned them ourselves—12 draft laws. Today I feel that roughly the same amount is being added.

[Lukyanov, interrupting] No, Nikolay Ivanovich, 24 laws (?are to be adopted). I have counted them.

[Ryzhkov, continuing] Twenty-four laws! Comrades, I understand that we need definite laws, but let us not

overload the boat. If we overload it, it will sink. We are unable to make these 24 laws. It would mean our sitting day and night, doing nothing else, and even then we would need months and months, and I do not know whether or not we would get through it before the end of the year, if we did not deal with anything else. Do we need to overload? Let us actually select those laws without which it is impossible to go over to the market. After all, is it right that we are going over to a market, yet today we have no law, let us say, on the taxation of profits? But this is the main question. Well, I realize that all the others are also necessary laws, but if that law is missing, there will be no market at all. Or, in that case, I have to come to you and say: Esteemed comrade deputies, I bring to your notice, or at least, I will ask you, let us leave for then, for 1991, the individual standards, those that have applied during this five-year plan period. Will that be satisfactory? I do not think so. It is pointless for you to say that it will. Right, it is no good. So this law must be passed. It is necessary to pass an antimonopoly law. If you do not like this, then say: We do not agree with the government proposal, but make a decision; make it, but then, if prices go up and the turns of the spiral really get going, then I will step up to the rostrum and say: We suggested to you, we suggested a way to cut off the spiral somewhere, but you did not want to.

So I would ask: It is necessary to select those laws without which it is impossible to live and without which it is impossible to take the first steps. Otherwise all our conversations remain absolutely futile. Let us set aside somewhat those laws that can wait for a little until next year, the beginning of next year, and so we will work on them and omit them.

Last, several times during discussion people have spoken here of the government's report. I well remember these proposals, but I did not want to go into that discussion today in my concluding words and to raise the question, but I do want to say the following to you:

Precisely ten months ago, USSR ministers and deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers stood for three weeks at this rostrum. Was that not a report-back? Was not that a concrete conversation with each branch, each area, or each complex? Four or five months passed and the Second Congress of People's Deputies was underway. I stood at the rostrum for two hours, and for five days I listened to what everybody was saying. Was not that a report-back, a conversation on economic topics? Five more months passed and we talked about the economy for four days in a row. So what is the matter? Do you need a formal report-back? Or is it necessary for the government to do this every month? Then it is another matter. Let us agree then to have a report-back once a year. It is due, yes, this has been put in writing; let us agree in what month we should present an official report-back. I will sign it officially and then we will talk because some sort of system is needed, but to say each time, each time: We want the government to report back; and that is all, well, listen....

[Unidentified speaker from the audience] Once a year!

[Ryzhkov] Comrades, we need full clarity in this issue, but to whip up the atmosphere each time with demands such as—let us listen to them; let us put pressure on them; let us drive them all out—serves no good. We must find a normal-working position for both the parliament and the government. Therefore, I apologize for having touched on these issues, but I would ask you and would submit a proposal: Let us think for a one more week. It seems to me this would be reasonable.

[Lukyanov] Thank you.

Ryzhkov Interviewed on Price Increases

PM3005090490 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 30 May 90 Single Edition p 1

[Interview with N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA political observer S. Karkhanin during the recess between sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 29 May: "Breaking Out of the Vicious Circle: Conversation With N.I. Ryzhkov, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers"—first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] The course of debates on the government's report at the Supreme Soviet session has, to judge by the mail received at the editorial office, been at the center of our readers' attention in recent days. The diversity of views and the topicality and complexity of the problems concerning reforms in the economy require a commentary at first hand, so to speak. In the recess between the session's 29 May sittings, N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, talked with SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's political observer.

[Karkhanin] Nikolay Ivanovich, the deputies have put forward different and often mutually exclusive positions, what is your view of this?

[Ryzhkov] A complex situation is taking shape, certainly.... I think, nonetheless, that everyone agrees on one thing: The transition to a market system is necessary. I have not heard a single speech expressing a different view. The question lies elsewhere: How, at what pace, and in what time frame to go over to the market system. This really does worry everyone, and among deputies, too, it prompts different opinions. Frankly speaking, I expected nothing else. We are talking about the radical question of socioeconomic perestroika in our state, and that means that the discussion could not have been painless. Heated disputes and debates were inevitable.

There are a few fundamental points on which attention is keenly focused. First, prices, that is what worries people most. And there is less talk of wholesale and purchase prices—these, it seems to me, have been left in the background during the debates. Although it is these prices that largely determine the life of every enterprise and labor collective, that is, the environment in which

the individual spends a large part of his time. Perhaps people are not yet aware of the linkage between purchase and retail prices, although that linkage exists, and is a very close one. As for retail prices, here the debates are heated.

[Karkhanin] But the point is, presumably, that in criticizing the concept proposed by the government, the deputies supplemented it with ideas of their own?

[Ryzhkov] Some comrades, in their speeches, say: This single increase in prices is wrong, we must find another way. What other way? They propose free prices. But in my view that path is even harder. We—our society—are not ready for it. We have not developed a mechanism capable of averting the costs that could ensue if free prices are introduced. That seems clear enough. But once again people start playing with words: A single increase is wrong, other ways must be sought. And again they start talking about free prices....

We have studied all these problems, and concluded: At this stage there is some sense in retaining fixed prices for certain goods, and for food products the fixed level will have to be retained for a long time.

There is much dispute about the stages of the reform. The stages, I should say, have remained the same as we proposed in December at the second congress. We have changed nothing, only brought forward the timing. As for compensation, we put forward our proposals in the report. Whether they are good or bad—they have to be discussed. Government organs are prepared to work on this problem together with deputies' commissions and committees. There are proposals for compensation for all purchasing losses, including those associated with the acquisition of gold in the stores. But I do not think that would get us anywhere, we would find ourselves back in the same vicious circle. All the same, there are bound to be costs, and we propose that these should affect purchases of luxury goods.

[Karkhanin] One deputy, P.L. Kazachenko, chairman of a kolkhoz [collective farm] in Tula Oblast, in conversation with me, produced a cogent argument on the need to increase bread prices. He cited a thought-provoking fact: The retail price of an ordinary brick and that of a loaf of bread are the same at present, although the investments of labor are, of course, not at all comparable. Obviously there can be no two opinions about it: Bread should be more expensive. But will it be possible, if the Supreme Soviet supports you, to start up the compensation mechanisms by July?

[Ryzhkov] We have made separate calculations on bread. I did not mention this in the report, there it was a question of the total compensation, of which bread forms a part. But if the deputies decide that our proposals can be adopted, people will be given compensation immediately. Students will receive it with their grant, pensioners with their pension, and working people at their enterprises and organizations. For the purposes of calculation, we took a family of four: two workers and

two children. The figure comes out at R41 a month. After all, the point is that the compensation is not only for bread, but also for all grain products—groats, pasta, confectionery, cakes.... As I said in the report, the total increase comes to 35 billion a year, so if we introduce it from the second half-year, the figure is 17.5 billion. That is divided into six months, and then there is a whole system for taking account of the age of the children and the categories of workers. I will talk about this in more detail in my concluding speech at the session.

I think a decision must be adopted on bread. Even from considerations of morality, ethics, we must do this. Let us give the people everything back, down to the last kopek, but all the same, let us rectify the situation with bread. After all, we are losing so much of it!

[Karkhanin] In the speeches at the First Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies mention has already been made of the new wave of speculative demand for goods and food products that began in recent days. In Moscow it is very noticeable, too: Everything on the shelves is snapped up successively. What measures are needed, in your view, to stabilize the situation?

[Ryzhkov] First, it is necessary to explain that if there are price increases, there will be compensation. In any case, people cannot buy flour for two years ahead.... Second, perhaps it is a good idea for local organs to take defensive measures. I am not inclined, for instance, to criticize the Moscow City Soviet, as some comrades are now criticizing it for the measures it has adopted in relation to trade on the basis of passports. It is another matter that these measures should, in my view, be temporary.

Ryzhkov Defends Economic Blueprint

*LD2905131190 Moscow TASS in English 1304 GMT
29 May 90*

[by TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov addressed the USSR Supreme Soviet today with his final remarks upon the completion of the debate on the government's blueprint for a transition to a regulated market economy. A total of 89 deputies spoke in parliament on the issue on May 24, 25 and 28 and during the morning session today.

The discussion revealed a virtually unanimous opinion: A market is required, there is no other alternative, said the Soviet premier.

Some deputies reproached the government for taking but a "minor and timid step". Ryzhkov said that because "the country is not yet ready for a forced transition to a market and neither is public opinion", the government cannot take unjustified risks.

For this very reason, the government refused to free all prices immediately and suggested their revision instead with a gradual expansion of principles of free price formation.

This option makes it possible to forecast a situation and carry out an effective system to protect the population against the rising cost of living, Ryzhkov pointed out. It is impossible to balance the market by increasing the production of goods and services under the existing deformed prices system. A refusal to review prices will complicate the problem, Ryzhkov observed.

In 1988, about 100 billion roubles worth of prices were to have been revised. Now the point at issue is about 200 billion roubles. If more time is wasted, the figure will soon increase up to 300 or even 400 billion roubles.

Defending the government-proposed tripling of bread prices from July 1, Ryzhkov said that all extra expenses involved—or 17.5 billion roubles within six months—will be returned to the population.

Arguing with deputies who said that an effective transition to a market-driven economy is impossible if the existing structure of economic management is preserved, Ryzhkov emphasised that the system will be transformed and become completely different within the next year or two.

Destroying this system during the current period of large-scale changes would be extremely dangerous, he said.

Ryzhkov pointed out that the transition is possible only given the consolidation of efforts by all people and their active support.

He called on all Soviet people to "give serious thought to their actions" and not to give in to panic, "buying up everything there is, things that will perish and will not be needed to anyone, stripping the deficient market completely bare."

"We will have to conduct a truly nationwide discussion of this complex, but absolutely necessary step towards transforming the economy, which affects the way of life and the fate of the living and succeeding generations," Ryzhkov said.

The Supreme Soviet will start the approval process in the afternoon.

Supreme Soviet Debates Government Economic Report **LD2905132290**

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0830 GMT on 29 May carries a nine-minute report by

correspondent Andrey Nikiforov from the USSR Supreme Soviet session. The Supreme Soviet is spending a fourth day debating the government's report on the transfer to market relations. A total of 84 deputies have spoken in the debates. The crux of the matter under debate is not whether, but how, a market economy should be introduced and what measures should be implemented to prevent the transitional period from being too painful for the population. Nikiforov describes the remarks by Deputy Lapygin, who criticises shortcomings in the report, and Deputy Kozyrev, who believes there needs to be a state program to combat organized crime included in the program for the transfer to a market economy. Many deputies speaking today believe it wrong to begin the transfer to the market with price reforms. The issues of the formation of a labor market and of a law on employment were raised today.

Nikiforov then presents a recording of the speech by Deputy Krasilnikov, who notes the immense significance of the issue since it affects everyone in the country. He says the role of the government is to defend its people. According to Krasilnikov, the debate has shown that the proposed program has many shortcomings that could have "undesirable consequences" if it is implemented. The main shortcoming he says, is this: "Simply to raise prices is unacceptable both for me, as a people's deputy, and for my electorate, for the following reasons. The transfer to the market means the development of competition and the development of independence. What independence can there be for enterprises if prices are to be rigidly set? I believe that the role of the government in this case is to set the upper ceiling for prices, and those enterprises that are able to keep prices lower when prices are recalculated would enjoy tax and other privileges. Then, right at the initial stage, we would acquire elements of competition and would begin to educate people capable of living under market relations." Krasilnikov adds that the report is riddled with the word "plan." "This means that, conceptually, we have not discarded this dogma according to which the plan determines our future." "The most terrible thing in it is that a reduction in the living standard of the population is being planned," he says. Krasilnikov believes that over the summer, the program should be revised and the functions of the State Planning Committee, State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, and the State Committee on Prices should be radically altered to allow the transfer to a market economy to go ahead. He criticizes the government for not moving sooner to provide social protection for the population. He concludes: "The price rises in the form in which they have been presented to us should be regarded as unacceptable because they represent an anti-people and anti-market measure."

Correspondent Nikiforov concludes his report by saying that two remaining speakers are insisting on speaking, after which Ryzhkov will respond.

Many Variations Suggested

LD2905215690 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 29 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The USSR Supreme Soviet session has been discussing the government's program for the transition to a regulated market economy for four days. Today, many deputies not only criticized this program, but also proposed their own variations for a transition to the market—in their view, a less painful one. As a result, a decision on the government report was not adopted, but was handed over for further work to the committees and commissions. The timescale for this work was also determined—a week. And not an account of today's plenary session.

[L. Khatayevich, identified by screen caption] I recall that yesterday evening, when determining the working procedure for today's session, the deputies decided to allocate further discussion to just one part of the government program. In fact, this took up two hours and 20 minutes. Ninety one deputies took part in the discussion before Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov made his concluding remarks. The distinguishing characteristic of this discussion was the wide participation of USSR people's deputies who are not members of the Supreme Soviet. They accounted for a third of those who spoke.

Today's discussion followed approximately the same lines as those of previous days. Summing up the opinions that were voiced by deputies, one can note their agreement on the issue of the need to transfer to the market, but also their concern at how this complex process will take place. There were the most diverse points of view on this and the most diverse proposals, from formulating a question about confidence in the government, to totally specific proposals whose adoption, deputies thought, could mitigate the forthcoming complications of economic reform.

The same diametrically opposed points of view were expressed on price reform. In particular, the opinion was expressed that it was essential for them not to be raised in total, but that they should be redistributed according to groups of goods—something which might possibly mitigate the negative consequences. There was a particular group of proposals by deputies relating to the inevitable complications which would arise in the labor market.

Particular note should also be taken of the statement by Deputy Oleynik, who read a decision by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. One of that decision's three points demanded that a decision should not be adopted on price changes without that issue having been discussed by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR.

After the discussion had ended, as I have already said, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov made his concluding remarks. [passage omitted]

Deputy Boyko spoke on behalf of the commission which prepared the draft decision. The commission proposed two decisions for the deputies' verdict, two drafts: one on issues of the economy's transition to the market; and a second one, taking it outside the framework of the general problem, on raising bread prices. Discussion of these decisions showed that an agreement cannot be adopted on them today. By the time that work was to end, more than 20 deputies remained on the list of those who had registered but had not managed to take part in the discussion. Upon a proposal by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, it was decided to transfer the issue to committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet, and to give them a week to prepare the necessary documents, taking account, of course, of the most diverse points of view voiced by the deputies.

Decision Postponed

LD2905161290 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT
29 May 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Following several hours of discussion of a resolution on the Soviet Government's plan of transition to a regulated market economy, parliament postponed a decision on the issue until next week.

At the end of the afternoon session, the prime minister again took the floor, suggesting that parliament's committees and commissions, together with the government, be instructed to elaborate the text of a resolution taking into consideration the large number of suggestions and additions made. Members of parliament agreed with the proposal without voting.

At the beginning of the afternoon session parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov recalled a suggestion, voiced by a number of deputies, to put to the vote a motion censuring the government.

The results of the vote on the issue revealed, if not the government's power, then an obvious weakness of the opposition: The motion was rejected by an overwhelming majority.

Parliament will resume work on Wednesday in its chambers. On Wednesday morning the Council of the Union will consider the first reading of bills on public organizations in the USSR and on freedom of conscience, and in the afternoon the bills will be the subject of consideration in the Council of Nationalities.

No-Confidence Vote Rejected

LD2905133690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1300 GMT 29 May 90

[Excerpts] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session. We are going over to the all-Union radio correspondent's post at the Kremlin. At the microphone is Olga Vasilenko. [passage omitted]

[Vasilenko] There is one more moment in the work of the session over the past hour to which I would like to draw the attention of the listeners. Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov recalled that a number of deputies—Gryazin, Filshin, Levashev, Plotnikov, for example—had raised a question of no-confidence in the government. Other deputies—Mukhametzyanov, Golik, Prokushev, Oley-nik—spoke of the need to untie the government's hands, and to help it, since the deputies themselves had appointed it. The question for voting was posed thus: Who is in favor of not putting the question of confidence in the government, but of going on to the discussion. As you will understand, this took place before the discussion of the draft resolutions began. So, 312 deputies voted in favor of not putting the question forward, while 42 voted for it being put forward. Thus the question of no-confidence in the government was dropped, and now the discussion of draft resolutions that I told you about is in progress. That is the end of my report on the work of the session.

Debates Continue on Economic Program 28 May *LD2805220190*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2000 GMT on 28 May carries a 97-minute video report on the 28 May proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The presenter says that discussion continued on the government program to improve the economy. The format of the video report is a series of clips of extracts of deputies' speeches. None of the deputies who are seen speaking are identified, either by the program presenter or by screen caption.

At 2001 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks about pricing. Several deputies debate the issue of state orders as against pricing mechanism in a market economy. Another deputy says that the move toward a market economy is not another New Economic Plan which was a concession.

At 2020 GMT an unidentified deputy says he cannot support the market economy because of the question of protection of the poor. They will face difficulties as a result of the price rises.

At 2025 GMT deputies continue to debate what they understand by a market economy, with one unidentified deputy supporting the notion of minimal involvement of the state. Full freedom is needed in determining wages, he says, while taxes should be regulated. Another deputy says that state orders should account for 70 percent of production while only 30 percent should be open to market pricing.

At 2032 GMT an unidentified deputy notes the difficulty of asking people for another five years of sacrifice after all they have been through already. The past five years of perestroika have not yielded positive results.

At 2038 GMT a deputy says that the country faced much greater difficulties after the war, and people were less complaining than they are now.

At 2040 GMT an unidentified deputy says that the people are growing tired of the uncertainty. He says that not enough attention is being paid to the producer. There has to be a process of bringing enterprises out of the state orbit. There has to be shareholding in the activity of enterprises.

At 2046 GMT an unidentified deputy says that if the program is submitted for a referendum it will be rejected. A commission should be formed to draft a new version of the concept. It should not be imposed from above. The deputy cites the Polish example of when Rakowski sought to impose an economic program—it was rejected by the people.

At 2050 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks of the imbalance in the economy which must be remedied. The Soviet Union went over to the market last year in conditions of a monopoly. A monopoly seeks to maximize profits by reducing output and making the people pay as much as possible.

At 2057 GMT an unidentified deputy criticizes the pricing mechanism in the program. He says that the program should not be rejected outright but improved.

At 2100 GMT extracts of speeches from the evening session are shown.

An unidentified deputy says that the new economic program will introduce new elements into people's life and work. There will be difficulties in the initial stage. Therefore, the program cannot be adopted without a referendum.

At 2103 GMT Deputy Kugultinov speaks cites an article in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA which reported that a Turkmen boy had died of starvation. This is a national scandal. He says that perestroika is a blessing and that it should be explained to the people that capitalism is not such a monster.

At 2108 GMT an unidentified deputy says that a market economy should be regulated. The program lays too much emphasis on the negative consequences of the market instead of highlighting its benefits.

At 2111 GMT an unidentified deputy says that realistic prices should be fixed taking into account various economic factors.

At 2113 GMT a deputy says that price rises should be linked to remuneration.

At 2117 GMT a Turkmen deputy talks about the high unemployment in his region. As a result, there is a great deal of social tension. He says that there are 6 million people in the country who cannot find work and this leads to a rise in crime.

At 2119 GMT a deputy from the Leningrad Kirov works says that his collective supports the transition to a market economy but wants guarantees, including more freedom for enterprises. Monetary reform should be introduced favoring those who have "honest savings." Compensation for price rises is required. Wine and vodka prices should not be increased.

At 2123 GMT Deputy Denisov from Leningrad says that the price rises proposed by the government have nothing to do with the market. Instead of increasing supplies the program is aimed at suppressing demand.

At 2126 GMT an unidentified deputy says that the program has little to do with the market. Its goals are primarily political aimed at satisfying obsolete socialist dogmas. We have exploitation already—only without its benefits.

At 2132 GMT an unidentified deputy says that the system of compensation for price increases should be more detailed, especially in the northern regions.

At 2136 GMT Lukyanov, who is chairing the session says that those speakers who want to speak will have an opportunity tomorrow, 29 May. Afterwards, Ryzhkov will sum up the debate and a decision will be adopted.

'Anti-Market' Speeches Noted

LD2805171690 Moscow TASS in English 1657 GMT
28 May 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—The third day of debates on the government plan of transition to a regulated market economy was not as heated as the two previous ones. Although the number of deputies wishing to speak grew, it seemed at times that the speakers had poor knowledge of the plan and used the rostrum not to analyse but to "secure" additional benefits for their constituents. Many also engaged in abstract discourse.

Today marked the first time that openly anti-market speeches were made. For example, a driver from Kharkov, Leonid Sukhov, proposed "to upgrade the planned system" in order to alleviate the country's economic woes.

"After all, it helped the USSR rise from the ruins after the Second world War and predetermined the downfall of the world colonial system. If the plan system is so seriously flawed as is said nowadays, the USSR would not have enjoyed high international prestige in the 1950s." He was supported by a deputy from Karelia, Vladimir Stepanov, who asked "to give the floor to those economists who espoused anti-market views."

Many speakers spoke about ways to "deliver" the necessary information regarding the market to the population. "It is not managers but the population who should be prepared for such a transition," said Sergey Ryabchenko, a physicist from Kiev. Otherwise, in market conditions

people will encounter "as many dangers as animals born in captivity when they are released into the wild."

"The advantages of the new economic system should be shown, because the fear of the market has become one of the main obstacles to it," says a deputy from Izhevsk, Nikolay Yengver. Having stressed the importance of protecting low-income social groups, he said it was possible "if the state does not hold back the initiative of the most active part of the population." Yengver supported the government-proposed price reform as "just and leading to the normal price proportions."

An opposite view was expressed by scientist Anatoliy Denisov, from Leningrad, who called the price reform "a trivial hike in prices", which does not bring the country any closer to the market. "Even if the government is moving towards the market, it does so by walking backwards." In its attempts to balance the market it only limits demand without expanding the production of goods, which is also restricted by prohibitively high taxes.

The scientist believes that, for all the need for the transition to the market, the latter is not a panacea. If with the help of the plan, which, incidentally, is successfully used under capitalism, "we have managed to wreck socialism, we can just as well not only wreck socialism but also capitalism with the help of the market." The State Planning Committee, as long as it exists, should draft a goal-oriented programme for the phased transition to the market, Denisov said.

The USSR Supreme Soviet is expected to finish the discussion of the plan on Tuesday in the first half of the day and then vote on it.

Ryzhkov 25 May Press Conference Summed Up

PM2805152190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Radical Renewal. N.I. Ryzhkov's Press Conference"]

[Text] A meeting between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Soviet and foreign journalists covering the proceedings of the USSR Supreme Soviet session was held in the Kremlin 25 May. Opening the meeting, the head of the Soviet Government emphasized that, judging by the debate on main report, the transition to a regulated market economy is the most important topic to have been debated during the entire USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings. After all, the problems under discussion are crucial to the life of our country both at the current stage of development and in the near and more distant future.

Are we satisfied with this debate? Constructive ideas have been expressed in many of the speeches, new approaches have been put forward for the solution of specific questions, and we are grateful to the comrades

who are submitting specific proposals to improve the document under discussion.

At the same time, there are also speeches which do not introduce constructive elements. It has been stated, for instance, that the government is incapable of implementing this program. I believe that it is necessary first to discuss this program properly, and then to draw conclusions.

The question has arisen: What is this, a new government program replacing the program for economic recovery which was discussed earlier? I want to say again: It is a development of the program for the country's economic recovery, it specifies the ways and stages of renewal of the economic reform which was approved at the Second Congress of People's Deputies five months ago. We have involved scientists, production managers, and financial experts in its elaboration, and we have consulted union republic government chairmen. In other words, there has been the widest possible range of discussions in the course of which quite a few new proposals were submitted and optimum solutions found. The government report was compiled on the basis of these documents. Generally speaking, a complex and difficult path has been traversed.

However, the concept is being criticized, and criticism is coming both from the left and the right. Some people are claiming that it is too radical a step, while others assert that, on the contrary, it is too cautious and we must advance more resolutely. I would like to say that we have considered all the options. It has been suggested to us to take the path of "shock therapy" in order to subject the national economy to market forces. We cannot take this path. Society and the state are not ready for such a path. Therefore we have rejected it.

The second path is more conservative: It suggests keeping as close as possible to the old planned economy practices. We have rejected that, too. We have traveled this path, and we know the results to which it leads. The best balanced option was chosen. The government is backing it.

We believe that the option under which market relations operate should be chosen. We must introduce this mechanism in the country.

I believe that state regulation should be retained during the first stage, and it will consist mainly of influencing price formation. A certain section of prices—wholesale, purchasing, and retail prices—will remain in the hands of the state. There must be a ceiling so as not to spark off new spirals of inflation.

The most acute problems, as can be judged by the number of questions which they have prompted, are associated with price formation and the social protection of the population. I noted in the report that, as regards these decisions, we are approximately two years behind schedule. The price reform should have been carried out two years ago when we were switching to new methods of

management and introducing economic accountability at enterprises and organizations. But the time has passed and the moment has arrived when we must finally make up our mind: Either we really embark on a price reform right now, or we retain our old positions in which case we can hardly expect high returns from our work.

Naturally, the proposals set out by the government are radical. This has been dictated by life itself.

After all, what we have before us are not speculative decisions as to the percentage or factor by which prices should rise. Every figure is backed by a specific calculation and logic. Therefore we believe that, in the sphere of retail prices, it is most important to ensure the broad protection of our people. This could be described as social protection or social support. Either term is possible, in my opinion.

The practice of compensations and index-linking was unknown in our country. We have come across this for the first time. Proposing to introduce one-shot price increases as of 1 January 1991, and in the case of bread as of 1 July 1990, we must at the same time compensate the population for the expenses it will incur. As for bread, the compensation should be total, down to the last kopeck.

Speaking about compensation as a whole in respect of the one-shot increase in retail prices, it is our opinion that some 70 percent of the price increases should be compensated, while 30 percent need not. As mentioned before, this applies to jewelry articles, alcoholic beverages, luxury goods, and so forth.

In the longer term, as we gradually "release" prices, that is when we switch the economy to the system of deregulated prices, it will become absolutely necessary to introduce index-linking to control price increases. This mechanism is currently being elaborated. We will attend to this question together with the trade unions, and will define the methods for providing social protection for our people.

The main point is to protect without fail the low-income sections of the population—pensioners, veterans, the disabled, students, and large families. We must take care of them first and foremost. Our task lies in fully compensating them for the expenses incurred as a result of higher prices. However, at the same time it is necessary to create conditions for highly productive labor on the part of the able-bodied population by means of all kind of measures, laws, and provisions. An effective mechanism to ensure this must be created.

It is our opinion that, in the next few years, prices for such food stuffs as bread, meat, fish, vegetable oil, and sugar should be regulated by the state.

The head of the USSR Government then replied to questions put by representatives of the Soviet and foreign news media. They concerned details of the concept of the transition to a regulated market economy. The

journalists also wanted to know how the radical steps proposed by the government in this sphere were received by society and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The press conference was attended by Yu.D. Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], and L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform.

Supreme Soviet Response to Ryzhkov Report

904A0383A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 25 May 90 p 1

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondents Yu. Vorobyevskiy, B. Grishchenko, and L. Yermakova: "Where Is the Way Out of the Impasse?"]

[Text] A joint meeting of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet was held on 24 May under the chairmanship of A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It began with the government report, "The Country's Economic Situation and the Concept of Transition to a Controlled Market Economy," delivered by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

USSR President M.S. Gorbachev took part in the meeting.

For a whole hour following the report N.I. Ryzhkov answered written questions from the deputies.

The questions reflected the spectrum of interests and agitation which have gripped our society on the threshold of such an important step. They also showed that not all the important problems have been sufficiently reflected in the report.

The chairman announced that 67 persons had applied to speak in the debate. Considering the shortage of time, the republics, commissions and committees, and deputy groups had appointed their representatives.

V.G. Kucherenko, chairman of the Planning and Budget-Finance Commission, declared that it was becoming increasingly difficult to justify the government's actions. At a time when production was falling and the style of economic leadership was incapable of preventing this, it could not be expected that the market would itself lead our society toward progress. To act thus would be to "reap the whirlwind." The speaker made specific proposals pertaining to the mechanism of transition to a market economy.

The time had come to answer a fundamental question: What was being offered for examination—the former government program with some alterations and additions or an entirely new economic concept. V.M. Vologzhin, chairman of the Economic Reform Committee, who posed this question, believed that the government

proposals were a continuation of the search begun earlier for paths of the country's economic recovery. It was now necessary to determine also the reasons for the failures of the earlier attempts.

It is necessary to create an extensive network of small businesses. Their flexibility and orientation toward the market would be the basis of a renewed economy. It is essential to pay increased attention to the creation of stock companies.

N.N. Gritsenko, chairman of the Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Commission, said, studying the problem comprehensively, we turned to experts and scientists and used the material of a number of sociological studies. One of them showed that more than half those polled support the market path of economic development. At the same time two-thirds advocated a gradual transition to the new forms, and only one-third, radical measures being implemented immediately.

The chairman of the commission declared on its behalf that we obviously have no way other than transition to a controlled market. But it is essential to explain to people in far more detail what awaits each of them. An in-depth analysis of the new pricing principles is needed, for example. It is just as necessary to explain the mechanism and sources of indexing and the amounts of compensation. The people should know all the expectations.

This thought was developed by many speakers, but was formulated most precisely, perhaps, by G.I. Yanayev, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions. In his opinion, the government report provided a rational explanation of the need for transition to new economic relations. But there are, besides this, such concepts as public mentality and fear of the market, capitalism, and loss of social guarantees. For this reason people need the whole truth about the consequences of the transition.

It was heard repeatedly that it was necessary first to create certain social guarantees and only then to embark on the new tracks of management, and not the other way about.

Incidentally, the proposed compensation policy in connection with the anticipated price increases should be such as to prevent the outbreak of "bread riots." It was noted that whereas the total increase in prices will constitute R200 billion, compensation will be only R135 billion. Is it not true that the government intends to solve the budget deficit in this way, at the expense of the people?

Total rejection of the proposed concept was expressed also. It was called another illusion inasmuch as ideology had, as before, prevailed over economics and no specific measures, other than increased prices, were being proposed. It was even suggested to put the question of confidence in the government to the vote.

By the end of the day the list of those wishing to speak had been supplemented by a further dozen names. The debate is only just getting under way.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Interviewed on Boris Yeltsin

LD2905220390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2020 GMT 29 May 90

[Interview with USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to unidentified correspondent in Ottawa on 29 May, before having lunch with Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney; from the "Television News Service" program—recorded]

[Text] [Video shows Gorbachev and Mulroney standing outside a residence, with Gorbachev speaking to unseen journalists]

[Correspondent] Are you concerned at the election of Mr. Yeltsin?

[Gorbachev] I have just answered this question to our own and Canadian journalists. I am concerned by the situation which has taken shape at the congress. A kind of confrontation has arisen. This affects the resolution of issues. In essence, well look, the epic in connection with the election of the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has been going on for several days.

Actually, the way it has turned out is that there was no one, no one had been found, there was no one among the contenders who would be capable of uniting the overwhelming majority of deputies. There was a peculiar stalemate situation. This evoked concern among deputies themselves and Russians. Major, difficult questions have to be tackled. What is needed is interaction and cooperation; and here there is confrontation.

This concerned everyone and there was discussion that it is necessary to consolidate. So that is the first thing which concerns me as regard the congress. You noted that in the third round, Comrade Yeltsin succeeded in adding only a few votes, achieving only a small majority (?of only five votes or so).

So the most topical problem in connection with the Russian Congress is the problem of uniting efforts to resolve, to elaborate, and to resolve those problems which face this largest republic of ours.

In recent days, Comrade Yeltsin has had to prove, to clarify his positions with regard to his adherence to the socialist choice. He said that he is not at variance with the position of the USSR President. He was asked to define more precisely his position with regard to how he regards the prospects for the development of the USSR and the role of the Russian Federation in the development and strengthening of the community.

He was asked whether he could cooperate and interact fruitfully with the president and the union government. His answer was in the affirmative. Finally, he expressed himself in favor of uniting all the streams which had arisen within the framework of the congress itself in order to deal with the problems which confront Russia.

If this is not a political ploy—for, after all, over several days quite serious corrections have been introduced for the best—if these are serious political positions, there will be certain consequences. But if this is a political ploy, there may still be difficult times. Then things will not be easy. We will wait and see. Life is richer than all teachers and examiners.

[Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, what feelings do you experience on your second arrival in Canada?

[Gorbachev] Good ones. Good ones. I even said when I was travelling with the governor general in the car that Canadians—the inhabitants of Ottawa in any case—should be taxed for oxygen! I have not yet had contacts with anyone except with the country's leadership, but those contacts—and there were very many of them—have left me with the strongest impressions and kind memories. Canadians appeal to me, their attitude to life, their solidity [osnovatelnostyu] and industry. Well, I think I will get more impressions and I will tell them to you later.

Anyhow, I have arrived for talks and not interviews.

[Mulroney in English] Just before we go, I want all Canadians to know that the idea for a new tax in Canada came from President Gorbachev and not from me. I've got enough problems right now! Thank you. We'll see you later.

[Gorbachev] All the best! [video shows, from left to right, Raisa Gorbacheva, Gorbachev, and Mulroney, with brief shots of reporters and cameramen]

'Unity' Group Hits 'Revisionist' Gorbachev

PM2605112990 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS
in English No. 20, 20 May 90 p 5

[Report by Andrey Chernov, correspondent in Lenin-grad, under "Events, Commentary" rubric: "Manifesto No. 2, or Nina Andreyeva's April Theses"]

[Text] If I dared conceal the name of the author of this document (who needs no introduction), I might at least introduce a note of mystery. For example, I could ask readers to guess who wrote the following first paragraph of this historical composition:

"On March 13, 1990, the evening session of the 3rd Extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies instituted the post of President. Hastily elected to this post the next day was M. S. Gorbachev, for whom a mere 59 percent of the deputies voted in an election with no alternative candidate. History has yet to assess this skilfully performed show..."

Here one needs to interrupt and ask to whom of the extreme "left-wingers" this paragraph belongs...

The theses for the April conference of the "All-Union society UNITY [YEDINSTVO], for Leninism and Communist ideals" were leaked to Leningrad's samizdat in virtually their original form. I have in front of me a xeroxed copy with home telephone of the author added in longhand. Evidently this "All-Union" society, headed by Nina Andreyeva, is not so closeknit and some covert democrat, who has wormed himself into its ranks, has made a secret party document public.

For some reason, this second manifesto of Nina Andreyeva's has not caused the sensation that the first one did (when it appeared a little over two years ago in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA). At any rate I haven't seen young boys with that revolutionary spark in their eyes hawking it for a rouble a copy the way they do, say that leaflet "Gdlyan Accuses". Yet it's a pity. Because for all of their differences, these two compositions have many similarities. I would even say that it is these strange conjunctions that account for the unpopularity of Manifesto No.2.

The distinctions start further on. "Contrary to all the assurances from restorers and revisionsists, the introduction of the presidency is virtually tantamount to undermining the power of the Soviets... The restorers have evidently come to understand that binding laws can be successfully introduced only with the 'power' methods of presidential rule.

"The presidency constitutes the political formalization of the crucial stage of counter-revolution and socialism's capitalization. The Gorbachev-Yakovlev-Shevardnadze revisionist group has now revealed its initially hidden aim of turning the Land of Soviets into a raw materials appendage and semi-colony of developed capitalist nations. The deliberately planned and artificially organized crises serves to denigrate socialism and to justify restoration. As a result, ethnic strife and social clashes have spread..."

I still have on tape a glorious utterance made by the same author in the lobby of the RCP's founding congress. Inasmuch as at that forum Nina Andreyeva was still not allowed to appear on the rostrum (evidently out of strategic considerations), the heroine of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA was giving interviews right in the hall.

"What is there still to be done about Stalinism?" one delegate asked credulously and poignantly.

"But there was no Stalinism," came the tender and persuasive reply. "It was concocted by those who denigrate..."

This rather strong proposition was further developed in the April Theses. According to Nina Andreyeva, the corresponding chapter in the new "Short Course" will read roughly as follows: fulfilling secret commitments to the chieftains of world capital, the counter-revolutionary

"Gang of Three", which usurped power in April of that well-known year, artificially imposed a crisis upon the country, discredited Marxism and bought up all the soap, tea and sugar in different regions of the country... However, let's trust the original:

"The presidency has unwittingly underscored the correctness of V.I. Lenin and I.V. Stalin's provision about the uniformities governing the aggravation of the class struggle at all stages of socialist construction..."

There you are—at all stages! True, it seems that Lenin didn't envisage anything of the kind, but isn't Stalin "Lenin today"? Aren't the founder of So-Solism (Stalin's nickname in childhood was So-So) and this woman wearing a brand-new Cheka-style leather jacket "twin brother and sister"?

"The capitulatory-restoring trends of perestroyka have reaffirmed in practice that... for the transition from capitalism to socialism..." Well, and so on, about the dictatorship of the proletariat and the incumbent "tsar" and "renegade Communist" in the presidential chair.

Here the style of the "April Theses" turns pompous and solemn: "By the logic of things (no accent is placed on the last word in Russian, regrettably, so I don't know whether the prophetess means "things" or special "prophetic" locic A.Ch.) the president must now ban the CPSU..."

Further on the text reads:

"The post of President enables Gorbachev to rise above the Party and objectively to play the part of its grave digger... Underway now is a Soviet reprint of the Chinese cultural revolution with fire being opened on regional and city Party committees whose leaders were less than zealous about converting socialism into capitalism... It became necessary to leave the post of General Secretary of the Central Committee to President Gorbachev so that he could finally smash socialism to pieces with the help of the Social-Democratic ram and reduce the CPSU to the position of a 'parliamentary party' of the Menshevik type. Evidently, the dubious laurels of such inglorious by-gones as the Kautskys, Zederbaums, Gurviches, Dans and other petty-bourgeois revolutionaries give him no peace..."

"The platform for the 28th CPSU Congress has been pharisaically declared to be an alternative to the restoratory Democratic Platform... But the differences between these platforms are only superficial and linked to the degree of camouflaging desertion and apostasy..."

"If the 28th CPSU Congress buries the Bolshevik party and revolutionary Marxism in a Menshevik embrace, the agenda will objectively include the question of reviving the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks-Leninists called upon to rout right-wing opportunism. The organizational principle of democratic centralism and the fundamental principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, which were borne of the experience of liberation struggle,

now for the umpteenth time being buried by anticommunists, will again confirm their superiority in practice in the course of a new historical contest between Menshevism and Bolshevism."

The conclusion—the creation of a "Boleshevik Party", demarcation with the Social Democrats who have entrenched themselves in the CPSU Central Committee, the dictatorship of the proletariat, a planned economy, internationalism and patriotism in their Nina Andreyeva or rather Stalin variations. And, of course, something which is taken for granted but is never mentioned even in such a classified Party document—prison camps and ditches full of gunned-down people (incidentally, in Kampuchea people were finished off more economically with cellophane bags tied up under their chins). Or will Andreyeva the chemist invent a more humane method for "demarcation with Social-Democrats"?

The document ends: "Motherland or death! Socialism or death! Ours is the righteous cause! Victory will be ours!" Every slogan occupies a new line, but without quotes. Why have quotes when both Nina Andreyeva and readers know whose words these are and on what occasion they were first uttered. Presumably, Iosif Vissarionovich will bear no grudge in the other world on seeing not his own but Andreyeva's signature under such flaming theses. Being of the same family, they'll get even with each other.

P.S. Inasmuch as this article relies heavily on citations, I request that MN remit my fee to the Memorial Society to assist the victims of Stalin's reprisals. Though these quotes have been taken from a document originally entitled "On the Current Moment", I hope that this moment has passed.

Gorbachev's Ability To Organize Referendum Viewed

*PM2905184190 London BBC Television Network
in English 2130 GMT 25 May 90*

[Interview with Viktor Kremenjuk, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences' United States of America and Canada Institute, in Moscow by news presenter Peter Snow in London 25 May, from BBC 2 "Newsnight" program—recorded]

[Text] [Snow] Well, earlier, I spoke to Viktor Kremenjuk in Moscow, one of President Gorbachev's foreign affairs advisers, and asked him why Aleksandr Vlasov had decided to withdraw from the Russian presidential election.

[Kremenjuk] After maybe sober analysis and calculation of his chances in the forthcoming election, he understood that he will... he can very easily lose that election, and he decided to withdraw, just maybe to avoid embarrassment.

[Snow] But doesn't this look like one in the eye for Mr. Gorbachev? I mean, here's his candidate for the presidency of the Russian Federation withdrawing because he realizes he's going to lose.

[Kremenjuk] Oh well, I think that, you know, this time maybe the popularity of Mr. Yeltsin together with unpopularity of Mr. Vlasov, you know, proved that even Gorbachev's weight was insufficient to secure Vlasov's victory.

[Snow] Now supposing Yeltsin wins: How will Mr. Gorbachev like that?

[Kremenjuk] Oh, I think, of course, he foresees difficult times for himself since, well, they were... they never went along too well, I would say. But nevertheless, they are not, I will say, they are not enemies. They are... maybe, they are heading in the same direction but with different speed.

[Snow] But how much of a political predicament tonight—with this vote of no confidence coming up in the Supreme Soviet as well: How much of a political predicament is Mr. Gorbachev in tonight?

[Kremenjuk] Of course, he has a lot of troubles since the situation in the country is deteriorating from day to day, and the government is unable to change anything in that area. And Gorbachev is bound to throw in his personal prestige and weight every time, you know, to save the situation.

[Snow] But is Mr. Yeltsin going to try and effectively take Russia out of the Soviet Union? Is he going to try and give Russia more power within the Soviet Union, then challenge Mr. Gorbachev on that?

[Kremenjuk] No, no, I don't think so: I don't think that that will be supported by the majority of the Russians. I think the majority of the Russians stand for a strong union, but of course, with maybe more respect and more attention towards the proper... the Russian needs proper.

[Snow] Now is Mr. Gorbachev backtracking on the Government's apparent readiness for a referendum on food prices because on the economy... because he said apparently, in his press conference with Mr. Mitterrand, that there was no mechanism for a referendum in the Soviet Union?

[Kremenjuk] I don't think that that can be interpreted as his desire now to disavow himself or to take his words back. I think that, simply, maybe what he wanted to explain that that, first of all, can't be done overnight; that the... maybe the returns of the results of, the returns of that referendum may be different and may be unpredictable and so on; just, maybe, to explain that we are entering some unknown waters.

[Snow] Will there definitely be a referendum, do you think, and when will it be?

[Kremenjuk] Oh, I think the most appropriate time for the referendum is somewhere within the next month—definitely before the first of July.

[Snow] As soon as that? And you think it will happen, do you?

[Kremenjuk] Oh, well, I think that still Mr. Gorbachev has enough of power and influence to organize such a referendum.

Gorbachev Sends Greetings to Slavonic Festival

LD2505110690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1728 GMT 23 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 23 May (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev has sent greetings to those taking part in the All-Union Festival of Slavonic Literature and Culture who are meeting at present in Minsk, the capital of Belorussia. Such meetings, he writes, are becoming a good tradition of brother peoples and facilitate the development of their historical memory, the progress of national culture and the strengthening of the cultural community. They enable the sources of wisdom of many generations who have bequeathed to us enduring relations between the nationalities, humanitarian values and very rich literature and arts to be addressed more and more.

Primakov Interviewed on Economy, Ideology

PM2905125390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 90 p 2

[Interview with Ye.M. Primakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and member of the Presidential Council, by L. Lagutina: "Ye. Primakov: 'No Prosperity Without Hard Sweat'—no place or date of interview given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov is 60 years old. His childhood and school years were spent in Tbilisi. He graduated from Moscow's Oriental Studies Institute and did postgraduate studies at the Moscow State University Faculty of Economics. He became chief editor of broadcasting to foreign countries at the age of 27. That was when he joined the party. He gained the degree of candidate of sciences at age 30, his doctorate at age 39, and became an academician at age 50. He spent a long time working with PRAVDA, including the post of the newspaper's own correspondent in the Near East. He was director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Oriental Studies Institute, and afterwards of the World Economics and International Relations Institute. He was elected candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee at the 27th CPSU Congress, later becoming a full member of the Central Committee, and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo in 1989. He is a winner of the USSR State Prize and of the Al-Nasir and Avicenna international prizes. Member of the Club of Rome, he was also a member of the UN University Council. He was elected chairman of the

USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union in 1989. He is presently member of the Presidential Council.

[Lagutina] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, the term "team" is widely used in political terminology abroad—the Reagan team, the Bush team, the Kohl team.... Could it be said that the Presidential Council is Gorbachev's "team"?

[Primakov] Only partially. In my view, the term "team" is much more narrow, functional, executive. The Presidential Council has different functions. I would use the term "brainstorming" to define them, a term which, incidentally, is well known to members of the scientific and technical creativity centers which are so popular in the Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] nowadays. The Presidential Council must help the president to work out comprehensively considered decisions. This does not in any way make it mandatory for participants in this process to always and fully agree with one another in everything. The more diverse the initial approaches, the more balanced the final result.

[Lagutina] And does the Presidential Council live up to this?

[Primakov] To the extent that I can draw conclusions from its sittings—yes. I was sincerely gratified by my participation in the debates which developed there. That was a sharp and frank conversation and—and this is especially important—it was productive in terms of ideas. Even the Politburo has distanced itself greatly from trivial discussions, but a powerful fresh flow can really be felt in the Presidential Council.

[Lagutina] Can it be said that you personally are on the Gorbachev "team"?

[Primakov] I hope so. I am one of Mikhail Sergeyevich's principled supporters when it comes to views and, furthermore, I am profoundly impressed by many of his personal qualities, primarily his dialectical thought and profound human commitment to the cause.

[Lagutina] Do you associate our state's future with geopolitical aims?

[Primakov] Geopolitical aims are receding further and further into the background. Formerly it was held that territorial size, for example, was a primary indicator. You must agree with me that this is certainly not the case now.

At the same time, our country's development model must be unique. It is impossible to get away from the fact that we live in a Union with numerous national formations. We need a state model which, on the one hand, utilizes the vast space for economic activity in everybody's interests and guarantees defense and foreign policy based on the entire country's might. On the other hand, such a state model must guarantee the preservation and development of all peoples' national originality. Taking this originality, history, and traditions into account, relations between the center and the republics

must not be built according to one and the same blueprint. Closer ties will emerge in some directions, while confederative principles will be unavoidable in others. Incidentally, the right to secede from a state's composition is a sign of confederacy. This right is not enshrined in the constitution of a single federative state in the world.

I am, however, convinced that the country's future does not lie in the development of centrifugal processes. World experience also proves this. Take Europe as an example: Integration processes are actively under way in the economic sphere, they are now extending to politics, and a Euoparlament has been formed. In our country nowadays it is fashionable to call for moves in the opposite direction. This is the price we are paying for our past. But it does not at all mean that this is the highway leading into the future. As soon as we get over this unreasonable outburst of egocentrism, there will be a pull in the direction of supranational structures. It is important to emphasize that each people must retain its originality in the process.

[Lagutina] It is, however, claimed with growing frequency that the Soviet Union is falling apart, that Lithuania will be straightaway followed by Latvia, Estonia, Moldavia.... Calls can also be heard to the effect that Russia—being the most oppressed republic—should be the first to pull out of the Union.

[Primakov] I would not describe a single republic as "oppressed." At the same time, however, it is a fact that Russia gives rather too much and it must live better. The republic needs a special and most thoroughgoing socio-economic program which would raise the population's living standards and would result in the provision of proper amenities for the Non-Chernozem Zone, Russia's historic center, as well as for the Far East, Siberia, and the Urals.

And now about Lithuania. Wherein lies the problem? In the self-determination method chosen by its present leadership. There is an ultimate goal—autonomy and independence. Landsbergis and the people around him have turned the political pyramid upside down: They announced secession from the Union overnight, hastily produced dozens of laws infringing the interests of other republics, the country's Constitution, and human rights, and then offered to conduct talks on good neighborliness and cooperation.

Look no further than the discriminatory certification system with simultaneous pledge of loyalty to the Landsbergis policy. Unless you swear accordingly you will not acquire citizenship and the pension that goes with it, nor can it be ruled out that you would be unlikely to receive foodstuffs, consumer services, medical services, and so on in the future. How is this to be appraised?

[Lagutina] Landsbergis has said in this context that they are acting within the framework of the universal regime

of violence prevailing in our country, seeing that they have grown up with it and have not yet managed to change....

[Primakov] Does this mean that we should applaud such words and actions? I have on many occasions received representatives of Lithuania's Russian-speaking population who have spoken about discrimination against them. Would you have us preparing for a fresh wave of refugees? No, this cannot be allowed to happen. Here we need to be not only flexible but also firm.

And think of the numerous economic, territorial, and defense issues that suddenly developed into conflicts. Instead of resolving them calmly, consistently, with mutual advantage in view. A few days ago I met foreign journalists who had visited Lithuania. One of them narrated the following joke: A Lithuanian is sitting on a tree branch, sawing away at it; a passerby asks him why he is doing it—"I'm breaking away."

What are we insisting upon now? To return the pyramid to a stable position so that we could follow the path of jointly agreed actions to the top—the republic's autonomy.

There is something else I must mention. The heat of pseudodemocratic passions in our country produced calls to destroy the "empire" allegedly created by the administrative edict system. If we are talking about a resolute and irreversible rejection of past deformations in interethnic relations—I am in favor. But if someone is cynically raising a hand against the fatherland and wants to break it apart—this is antihistorical and immoral. This is not simply a moral crime. It is nothing but paving the way to destabilization and bloody clashes. Even when standing on positions of utilitarian common sense, it would not be amiss to give some thought to the catastrophic consequences within the country and in the world as a whole that could ensue from the destruction of a great state like ours.

Consolidation is especially important right now, when we are mapping out a radical transition to market economy.

[Lagutina] This transition is really ominous for the population strata on average or low incomes. People are apprehensive, they are fed up with standing in lines and experiencing shortages. And now an impending price hike to top it all! Literally everything is being bought and hoarded.

[Primakov] The transition to market economy is necessary. But the state must keep its hands on the regulating levers. We are, of course, talking about regulation by economic means. A fully unregulated market does not exist even in the West today. Never mind about such a market existing in our own country under socialism. But how are we to arrive at a regulated market? I think that, proceeding from the present situation, there are two options which must be ruled out. The first one is the "shock therapy," in other words the Polish way. We are

certainly not indifferent as to whether we would jump from the fifth or the first story, whether we would land in water or on the tarmac. The second one is the leisurely continuation of today's trends without any attempt to break away from them. This path has already involved us in great costs. It would ultimately lead us into a blind alley.

Therefore, we need other options, differing in the degree of their planned measures' radicalness, in the staging of their implementation, in their socioeconomic consequences, and in the countermeasures designed to soften the effects of the "breakthrough."

[Lagutina] Many people are now talking about "crisis of ideology." In this context, what is your attitude toward articles claiming that Stalinism is rooted in Lenin's legacy and Marx's theory?

[Primakov] It is quite interesting to see how Western Sovietologists have divided on this issue. Some of them—the more rightwing—trace our entire subsequent history back to Lenin. Others say that there could have been an alternative to Stalinism after Lenin's death. Such polemics can also be perceived in our country.

I hold that Stalin did not stem from Lenin. One of N. Krupskaya's letters, written in the late twenties, was recently published: "Had Volodya been alive, he would have been sitting in jail now." Stalinism is something that was grafted onto our history by dint of circumstances and the development of events. I am convinced that things would have been different had people like Bukharin, for example, emerged victorious.

[Lagutina] But only very few of Lenin's works deal with the organization of the new society. Nikolay Berdyayev said in this context that Lenin hated the old system so much that he saw his main task as being to overthrow it, without giving any serious thought to the way of building socialism....

[Primakov] But this is not so. The last years of Lenin's life were a period of agonizing reflection on building the socialist society. Agonizing, because he sensed that time was running out. Because his associates had failed to comprehend what he had comprehended, having changed many of his views of socialism.

I would disagree with the claim that hatred for the old system was almost the main factor of Lenin's life and work. Yes, he did hate the old, decayed, and incapable system. Because of everything it did to the people. He was right—and certainly not the only one—in this hatred. Had it been otherwise, by the way, not only the October Revolution but even the February Revolution would not have happened. At the same time, however, look at the way he taught people to protect and respect those representatives of the old system—military personnel and members of the intelligentsia—who had agreed to work for the people's benefit.

As for a broader appraisal, while sincerely believing Lenin to be an unusually outstanding personality, I am convinced that it is impermissible and pointless to canonize him. The same applies to the attempts to back up our current actions by various quotations from Lenin. It is not simply a question of 70 years having passed, we now are in a qualitatively different age with totally different conditions of existence. But Lenin's methodology continues to serve us—and this is the main point. Methodology, rather than artificially transplanting in our soil sundry statements by him, either applying to a different time or dictated by specific and totally different circumstances.

[Lagutina] As far as I know, Solzhenitsyn's works, in which he reflects quite negatively on communism and communists, generate a certain amount of interest, especially among students.

[Primakov] I believe Solzhenitsyn to be a tremendously talented writer, even though I do not share his ideology. I was shattered when I read the "Gulag Archipelago," for example. But I totally disagree with many of his generalizations, primarily his appraisals of Lenin and the communist teaching.

[Lagutina] What is your attitude toward the Interregional Group of deputies?

[Primakov] The initial attractiveness of this group lay in its freshness of thought, the fact that it "spotlighted" quite a few new and interesting names.

But the Interregional Group also has some leaders with whom I totally disagree. I mean Yuriy Afanasyev in the first place. Here, of course, we have a complete watershed.

[Lagutina] You knew Academician Sakharov. Now he has become a sort of idol for many people, a symbol of struggle for truth, for veracity....

[Primakov] Sakharov was a great scientist and citizen. Maybe—no matter how paradoxical this might appear at first glance—the grandeur of a natural scientist, accustomed to the logical nature of scientific postulates and the strict orderliness of ongoing processes, somewhat diminishes a politician's realism. We used to sense instinctively, and now are consciously aware, that moral principles in our age must unequivocally become universal and mandatory for all. Is it, however, possible to disregard the fact that by no means all with whom we have to deal abroad, and even in our own country, are guided by such views?

It is in this context that some people talk about the naivety of this indomitably brave fighter for human rights. It is, however, the historical mission of such "naive" politicians to use their deeds and their lives as the means to lead people away from evil to good.

[Lagutina] What do you think about the convergence theory, which he considered fundamental? Many people write now that the Western countries' path is more suitable for us.

[Primakov] Previously I not only believed but also publicly said—and I believe so now—that the convergence theory was developed, first, by clever people, and second, by people who were by no means anti-Sovietists. It did not deserve the destructive criticism to which it was subjected in our country.

Some people now believe that socialism has proved to be an historically inconsistent experiment and that there must be a return to the capitalist path. Such a dogmatically ideologized presentation of the question reflects a lack of comprehension of the course of real development in the world. Capitalism has already changed beyond recognition and has transformed itself, also under the influence of socialism. What I mean is economic regulation at micro- and macrolevels, social policy, and even the evolution in capitalism's "holy of holies"—ownership. Capitalism has achieved all this, at times even going against what it preached.

We are also changing, even by making use of capitalism's best achievements—in economic management, promotion of scientific and technical progress, and the humanitarian sphere. In this process, however, it is important not to give up those values of ours which are real rather than false.

[Lagutina] Young people have lost their faith in old idols and, according to custom, are striving to place new ones on the vacant pedestals. But these new idols are at times the really false ones. Is this not due to the fact that young people are being deideologized to a certain extent? Look how many young people wish to leave and take up permanent residence abroad....

[Primakov] This is probably more than just a matter of deideologization. There is a difficult process of finding one's place in our sharply changing life. Some would rather opt for seeking manna from heaven in foreign countries. Believe me, though, prosperity cannot be achieved anywhere without "hard sweat."

Now, incidentally, by dint of a series of circumstances, we are taking a look at ourselves through a prism with critical refraction. A few days ago I was talking to a U.S. Sovietologist. "Of course," he said, "there is no comparison between living standards in our two countries. But I really envy you when it comes to the humanitarian sphere. You are living in a spiritually rich intellectual atmosphere." I realize that these words are no good to an out-and-out materialist, but I do not think that the majority of young people would fall within this category.

[Lagutina] Are you an optimist?

[Primakov] Boundless optimism, when you don't see difficulties and don't ponder mistakes, is alien to me.

But people dealing with politics cannot work without a sense of optimism. Otherwise they are simply earning a living....

Osipyan Views Presidential Council's Work

90UN1881A Moscow NEDELYA in Russian
No 19, 7 May 90 pp 2-3

[Report on interview with Academician Yuriy Osipyan, member of the Presidential Council, by Aleksandr Yevseyev: "We Are United in What Is Most Important: In the Understanding That Perestroyka Needs To Be Implemented as Quickly as Possible"]

[Text] The clock cast in ancient bronze ticked off time in measured fashion. The stern visages of academicians of the last century looked down severely at the academicians of the present century. The high-backed damask-covered wooden chairs were gently pushed back from the long polished table—another meeting in the office of the vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences had just ended. And all this—the representation, the bronzes, the old furniture—would put one in a solemn and uplifted mood.

But from time to time on the vice president's desk the telephone would ring, and a sunbeam would move around the office, illuminating the monitor screen and the printer with its loaded roll of paper. And the quiet of the academy office would be seared by the dry clatter of the "fax" installed in the reception area—some message of the Academy of Sciences was going to far-off Holland.

The 20th century gave a reminder of its presence.

An athletically smart, pleasantly smiling person was sitting at the solid desk of the vice president of the academy and politely and patiently watching as I was setting up the dictating machine. I was thinking that this pleasant smile was more a habitual professional or official necessity than a gesture in keeping with his mood (the vice president would hardly have been up to smiling toward the end of a work day)—like the hand proffered amicably, it awaited exactly the same response.

Instead, I said:

"I have a lot of questions, Yuriy Andreyevich. I fear that we will not have enough time."

Osipyan nodded:

"It doesn't matter, don't worry."

The interview began.

[Yevseyev] I think you will understand if I begin our discussion not with the subject which is the principal one for you, not with physics, and not with science and its problems, but with an event which is today of interest to all—I refer to the USSR Presidential Council.

[Osipyan] If you think this of interest, you are welcome. The more so in that the discussion will, evidently, for all

that, touch on some scientific problems also inasmuch as my presence on the Presidential Council is connected with science, with the fact that I am a scientific associate.

[Yevseyev] Permit me, then, to ask the first question: What do you think, why did M.S. Gorbachev wish to have precisely you on his council? Did you have some preliminary discussion on this?

[Osipyan] Well, first of all, he evidently wanted there to be a representative of science, more precisely, of natural science on the council. Of course, since it is the highest state executive authority shaping both our foreign and domestic policy, the council incorporates ex officio, so to speak, leaders of the principal state components. But in addition there are, let's say, representatives of Soviet society. Just that, society, not strata of the population, because this is more accurate. There are on the council two writers: Rasputin and Aytmatov. They represent our artistic, humanitarian intelligentsia. But at the same time, however, Aytmatov also expresses the interests of considerable numbers of the population of the Central Asia region. He knows well and understands what and how the peoples living there breathe. Rasputin, on the other hand, represents different strata of the population, a different way of thinking, a different philosophy—he is a Siberian, who was born and grew up in Irkutsk, he feels keenly the pains of this part of the Russian people and he has frequently demonstrated his resolve to have done with the outrages which have been perpetrated in respect of Baykal. At the same time he is the exponent of a certain system of world outlook characteristic of the Russian heartland. Yarin also, who represents the interests of the working class, but who at the same time expresses the views of particular strata of the population, participates in meetings of the council.... Incidentally, we have sat together at several meetings, and I can already see how his views are beginning to change—Yarin, it seems to me, is a sincere individual capable of reacting honestly to what is happening around him.

As far as I personally am concerned, I understand my appointment this way: Mikhail Sergeyevich deemed it necessary and useful to have on the council a person who understands what science is and how it may be linked with the life of society and who might express this. This is highly important, incidentally, because all our movements in the direction of perestroika connected both with sociopolitical and economic transformations are ultimately to create the possibility of all these transformations being infused with some material meaning, which may be accomplished only given the assistance of science and technology. Altogether, the path from science to technology, to the materialization of ideas, to their comprehension, to their being convenient for people and beneficial to them and working for them—all this is a very important part of the whole social process.

I will permit myself a short digression here and invite you to look at what has happened in Japan. Forty-five years ago this was a totally militarized country with a

totally militarized ideology—remember all those Samurai and Kamikazis—this entire fanaticism. What happened with Japan subsequently? Losing the war and having the atom bomb dropped on its cities led to a revolution in the minds of the Japanese—they quailed to see themselves conquered, and many people still bear within them a horror of war. This was the greatest national upheaval. Precisely this, because there had been no particular social or economic upheavals in society. Yet a technological revolution was accomplished in the country, and Japan became some model of the rational organization of production. Why? Because the social process developed in such a way that it stimulated the country's technical development and its economic progress.

But we have gotten away somewhat from the question as to whether I had had a preliminary discussion with Gorbachev concerning participation on the council. Yes, I had. All who are members of the council were appointed by the president. And before signing the decree on the appointment, he, of course, spoke with me, just as with all the other members of the council. As far as I am concerned, this was a lengthy, serious discussion. Face to face. For, probably, two hours. It began with the words, "I would like to propose that you become a member of the Presidential Council...." After which we began to discuss in detail what this, the Presidential Council, signified, what functions it was to perform and which functions the president wished to entrust to me. And what hopes he placed in me here. And what the work conditions would be.

[Yevseyev] What are they, if they are not a secret?

[Osipyan] I asked how all this would be combined with my scientific and scientific-organizational activity or whether all this would be purely state work, for which I would have to leave all my other business.

I told the president that, aside from scientific duties—mine personally or those associated with the activity of the Solid State Physics Institute which I lead—I had additionally international duties. Three years ago I was elected president of the International Physicists Council, and I am to take up this office in September.... And we agreed on the limits of my responsibility in respect of the questions with which I would deal on the council.

[Yevseyev] What else did the president ask about in his interview with you?

[Osipyan] Many things, but he asked no questions concerning my person here because, I think, he knows me well enough. We had met many times prior to this and discussed our scientific problems. Gorbachev has a serious interest in affairs of our science and, I would say, respects our scientific community. He has a good idea of what the contribution of science and of our intelligentsia generally to perestroika should be. I believe that the scientists' community will pay him in the same coin. Mikhail Sergeyevich had invited me on international trips repeatedly, and this was always complex work

connected with the preparation for negotiations, the drawing up of one document or another and preliminary discussion.

But let us not talk any more about me, let us return to the discussion with Gorbachev. I knew that the Presidential Council was a consultative body under the president which was to discuss and formulate issues of foreign and domestic policy. And that decisions were not adopted here, by way of a vote even less. But the mere course of discussion and also the statements of individual members of the council were to give the president a full picture of the problem.

[Yevseyev] Does Gorbachev express his view in the course of discussion?

[Osipyan] No, he merely clearly formulates the question which is to be discussed. As I understand it, before adopting any decision Gorbachev tries to extract for himself from the discussion all shades of opinions of the members of the Presidential Council on this question.

[Yevseyev] Are the speeches of the members of the council recorded?

[Osipyan] Of course. A stenographer works alongside us.... But the main thing, of course, is not the stenographic account but the fact that the result of a meeting of the council should be a decision on the part of the president.

[Yevseyev] Is there a great spread of opinions among the members of the Presidential Council?

[Osipyan] As far as questions of a principal, pivotal nature, so to speak, are concerned, it is not great. All members of the council are, it has seemed to me, supporters of the fact that perestroyka needs to be radicalized—speeded up and intensified. But there is a whole spectrum of opinions as regards how to do this and how to act in a specific instance, of course.

[Yevseyev] Did you take part in the discussion of the problems of the economic reform?

[Osipyan] Yes, of course.

[Yevseyev] Do you not have the impression that in mapping out a cardinal restructuring of the economy we have not always pictured fully to ourselves the possible consequences of our actions?

[Osipyan] Yes, I have. In addition, the main purpose of all the observations on the draft which we discussed and which has been presented by the government was precisely a need for a more specific computation of the consequences associated with one or another version of it. That reform has to be accomplished is, of course, recognized by all, but what we will encounter upon the implementation of one version of it or another is as yet not entirely clear. The main thing here, it would seem to me, is the precise formulation of measures to protect the working people as a result of possible price rises. Our

society can still take some certain magnitude of strain, but no more. It is therefore necessary to determine very precisely what level of social losses we can permit given one or another version of implementation of the reform.

[Yevseyev] Members of the council are aware, of course, that a market economy could under our conditions, at the first stage particularly, increase social tension. After all, its mechanism does not employ methods of persuasion and exhortation: "Please work well, boys," but purely economic methods which will motivate all of us to work well.

[Osipyan] Of course, all this is understood, and it is clear to everyone that it is necessary to switch to a market economy. But there are several versions of such a switch: "soft," "middle," and "tougher" or, as it is still called, "radical." Each of them entails certain social consequences. It would be fine to agree to the toughest version, which presupposes rapid radical changes not only in the economy but in society as a whole. But, one wonders: Could our society, which is quite variegated both socially and nationally, endure them? Would not the political consequences be such that the wave which we would cause in society would sweep us ourselves away also? I would say additionally that we must take account of each and everything before taking some step or other. Our approach must only be strictly balanced. This is why the Presidential Council, before sanctioning the transition to a market economy, deemed it necessary to gain a full idea of the possible social consequences of each version of the impending reform.

[Yevseyev] Even despite the fact that these proposals of the government had been discussed repeatedly, at highly representative scientific conferences also, what is more?

[Osipyan] Yes, although this will slow down the course of the reform somewhat, we believed that the government should, with economists' assistance, make a stricter calculation of all the consequences of each version.

[Yevseyev] Did you speak in the Presidential Council at the time of the discussion of the situation in Lithuania?

[Osipyan] Yes, of course.

[Yevseyev] Could you repeat what you said? What was your view?

[Osipyan] Well, it differed little from what the other members of the council said. The whole Presidential Council, both individually and as a whole, by no means rejects the wish expressed by the Lithuanian people to acquire sovereignty and state independence. It is merely a question of the steps by which this may be approached. In any event, the USSR Constitution cannot, of course, be waived here, the more so in that the USSR Supreme Soviet has worked out a special mechanism for a union republic's secession from the Union. Of course, we cannot express satisfaction at or approval of the tactical moves to which the leadership of the Republic of Lithuania is resorting—it is in fact disregarding the

provisions of the USSR Constitution and continually confronting the central government with faits accomplis.

[Yevseyev] You speak of the desire of the Lithuanian people, referring, of course, not to the decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet but the true wishes of the people, which may be expressed only by way of a referendum?

[Osipyan] Of course. The need for a referendum is envisaged by the mechanism of secession from the USSR which has been approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet. In addition, without a referendum neither the USSR Supreme Soviet nor the Congress of USSR People's Deputies may acknowledge that the opinion of the population of Lithuania has been expressed unequivocally. But the Supreme Council of the republic, which represents its population, currently rejects this step and does not agree to hold a referendum.

[Yevseyev] Why, do you think?

[Osipyan] I find it hard to answer. It is entirely possible that this is connected with our deep seated habit of politicizing our every step. "Sajudis" has only to ask itself: "Should we agree to a referendum?" and it is thereupon confronted with another: "But what will a referendum reveal? If what we expect, then, yes, we should agree to this step. But if the result is not in our favor? Why do we need it?" And a calculation of a variety of tactical options, which cloud and veil the actual situation, begins. We should not, I believe, politicize our every step, in the sphere of law included. If "Sajudis" is sure that it relies on the opinion of the majority of the population, then, naturally, it should not evade such a process as a referendum. This is, I repeat, the sole opportunity for the Lithuanian people to precisely and clearly express their wishes.

[Yevseyev] Naturally, the whole country would then adopt an understanding attitude toward the expression of the Lithuanian people's pleasure?

[Osipyan] Undoubtedly. It is necessary, finally, to take this first step in the sequence of steps envisaged by USSR legislation.

As far as the Soviet Government's measures in connection with the present situation in Lithuania are concerned, they are connected primarily, as I understand it, with the large demonstrative actions which are being exercised by the Lithuanian Seimas and the Lithuanian Government. This entire demonstration, even for public consumption in some respects, is, it would seem to me, tactically wrong and is making a mutual solution of the quite complex Lithuanian question more difficult.

[Yevseyev] Could it be said that Lithuania's leaders, like it or not, are constantly being forced to adopt keen-edged retaliatory measures, increasingly entangling an already complex situation? I would say even being provoked into this....

[Osipyan] Yes, this is the case. And I would like to emphasize this, despite all my respect for the intent of the Lithuanians or, let's say, their representatives in the Lithuanian Supreme Council. You cannot act in such a way as to constantly bring about some counteraction making the situation worse. It is not, after all, merely a question of realizing one's goal at all costs. Let us finally understand that the noblest goal may not be accomplished by "ignoble" means.

[Yevseyev] How do you see your role on the Presidential Council? Only purely advisory? Or something akin to a fixer from science?

[Osipyan] I have two principal functions: The first is representing science and technology in the president's entourage, and I hope that if the council discusses questions connected with science and technology, with society's penetration by scientific knowledge and with a solution of social problems which are connected with science and technology, my opinion will be taken into consideration. My second function, however, is to add a certain scientific element to the official decision-making process. In this case we may speak of a tendency characteristic of the modern world scientific community—it sees its role not only as being connected with the development of science in the world but also as presupposing its influence on the course of decision-making.

[Yevseyev] Could we not supplement this list of functions of a scientist participating in the work of our state authorities with one more: contributing an element, characteristic of scientific associates, of a logical, tolerant, and civilized approach to the actual decision-making process? I judge from the debates in our parliament, where the speeches of academicians Sakharov, Likhachev, Abalkin, Goldanskiy, and other of our prominent scientists showed what kind of logic the speaker's judgments should have, what their standard should be and what relations with the auditorium might be like. I believe that the scientists' good influence on the process which has begun in our parliament is beyond question.

[Osipyan] Thank you, it is pleasant for me to hear what you say, although I would be afraid to maintain publicly that all this is typical primarily of scientific associates: Would not people working in culture have a grievance against me? Although, of course, there is something in this—reflecting on the kind of solution there should be to a problem, the scientist usually not only sets forth and defends his views intelligibly and properly but, primarily, constructs them on the strict logic of some line of reasoning. And this chain, customary for the scientist, leads him from premises, substantiation, and inferences not only to some scientifically substantiated result but also dictates the nature of his relations with his opponents.

[Yevseyev] Could it be added: Dependent neither on emotions nor on views?

[Osipyan] It could.... In scientific work it is very important how you react to the arguments of the party with

whom you are contending. It is necessary to learn once and for all to listen to one's opponent and abandon hostility toward his arguments. In addition, if people of science had been unable to listen to their opponents, there would have been no progress.

[Yevseyev] What do you think, was it not with this—with an ability to display a balanced approach in judgments—that the pronounced "academization" of the Presidential Council was connected to some extent—there are four members of the USSR Academy of Sciences on it?

[Osipyan] I also would like to think that this is not an accident.... Incidentally, just look at how many representatives of science we have in the top legislative authorities—in no other parliament in the world is there such a number of scientific associates as with us. I would evaluate this as society's respect for its science and as hope that an intelligent, educated individual might better represent the interests of the population. So there is nothing fortuitous here. Generally, the number of those who in the past were engaged in scientific work is growing constantly in our country among people of state.

[Yevseyev] What can you say about the presidential team as a whole and its "academic" part?

[Osipyan] You have already mentioned that four of the "team" are members of the academy. I would add that they are all exponents of the scientific approach about which we have just been speaking. Yakovlev, Primakov, and Shatalin have spent a considerable part of their life in real scientific work and in research. We have all been lucky in this sense, I hope. If only because we have a single language of thinking, and for this reason there should be practically no disagreements among us. The Presidential Council is generally, as Gorbachev himself said at the first meeting, a council of the like-minded. I understand this in this way: We are united in what is most important, in recognition of the fact that we now need to implement perestroika at as fast a pace as possible because it is spinning its wheels and slowing down here, and we all believe that it needs to be radicalized. As far as the other components of how and what we understand are concerned, everyone has his own view, his own solution here, of course. Ryzhkov and Maslyukov, for example, that is, those who are closely linked with production, with economic life, with a multitude of day-to-day problems, when it is necessary to be responsible for the work of industry, for providing the national economy with raw material and equipment and for all components of our economy—they have their own approaches to the solution of problems, their own view of them. Another group—Kryuchkov, Bakatin—views our life from different positions. Their angle is law and order, possible social situations and negative processes which could occur in society. Primakov is associated primarily with social structures, with the phenomena

occurring in our social life, while Marshal Yazov conveys the ideas of the army and the problems of defense capability. Our life is quite diversely represented, as you can see.

[Yevseyev] You met President Reagan on several occasions and are acquainted with President Bush. Is it possible to compare their entourage with that of which you are today a member? Incidentally: What was the reason for your many contacts with representatives of U.S. leading circles? You are a scientist, not a politician.

[Osipyan] I will begin with the "incidentally": In connection with the fact that I am a leader of the International Physicists Union, I constantly had dealings with the U.S. President's science advisers, and they would always try to introduce me to the "boss." The purpose was a pragmatic one—to discuss some issue which they wanted to advance. It cannot be ruled out that they sometimes invited me as some additional argument in support of a decision they had planned. It would be a question of some joint projects.

As far as the presidential entourage is concerned, "they" and "we" could, of course, be compared, but there is an essential difference also. There is no Presidential Council in the United States, the President having several advisers. And, the main thing, he has a cabinet. The U.S. President, after all, performs the duties of prime minister. So that some of the President's team are advisers, some, secretaries. The secretaries adopt decisions in the field for which they are responsible. The advisers, however, have a different assignment—making available to the person who makes the decisions objective material on this matter, but under no circumstances imposing his opinion here. Unless the President himself requests advice, of course. For this reason the U.S. President selects his advisers mainly on the basis of their competence in some specific field. I believe that in forming the council Mikhail Sergeyevich had this aspect in mind also, but account was taken equally of some general civic attributes of each member of the council, too.

[Yevseyev] Could it be said that we already know today more or less accurately what our perestroika should be like—the plan is clear, and the main thing now is that it move more quickly? It is this task which the Presidential Council, which should at this stage of perestroika determine how this is to be done the most efficiently, is intended to accomplish?

[Osipyan] This is not, I think, entirely the case. It is now clear not only "what" to do but frequently "how" it should be done also. And it is by no means the Presidential Council's job to find this path. Its mission is rather to clear the way for onward progress. How we should be acting here is dictated to us by the basic laws now being enacted by the Supreme Soviet. However, implementation of the "action" itself is, indeed, to some extent the responsibility of the Presidential Council. But, mainly, of the president himself, of course.

I am sometimes asked why we need a president when we have a government. But just look: Our government is, after all, essentially something akin to a competent representation of various departments because our economy is divided into departments and into sectors, at the head of which are ministers, who close the circle with the Council of Ministers. But a regional executive authority—the soviets—are now emerging in the country. It is they which are the masters on their territory. And a natural confrontation, a dialectical, creative confrontation, I would say even, between the regional and sectoral authorities is emerging. And in order to progress painlessly, within the framework of the law, considering the interests of both the population of the region and nationwide state interests, presidential power—some unifier of the opposed interests—is needed. Just think about it: Who would arbitrate between a minister who has decided to build a chemical plant in a given city and the local soviet, which tells him: "Build your plant where you like, but not here. As for the production of chemical products in the country, this is not my city's and not our oblast's problem." I am exaggerating, of course, but only a president could solve such a range of questions. He is the supreme arbiter considering both national interests and territorial interests.

[Yevseyev] Could it not be said, to sum up this idea of yours, that a concept of presidential authority with us is that of an extra-departmental approach, the acute need for which we have, unfortunately, only just understood? There are the country's interests, there are the interests of the individual—there are no others....

[Osipyan] I fully agree.

[Yevseyev] Tell us, please, how often the council will meet. Have you discussed this?

[Osipyan] Of course. We have agreed to meet as necessary. I believe that this will appear roughly as follows: Once a week, once every two weeks.

[Yevseyev] What are your meetings like? Their atmosphere, procedure of discussion. Finally, where do you sit—at one table or somehow differently?

[Osipyan] At a long table, at the head of which is the president's chair. The meetings are held in his office on the fourth floor of the USSR Supreme Soviet building, next to the room where the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium meets. For the 15-17 persons who usually take part in a meeting of the council this is perfectly adequate. Papers are set out before everyone on the table.... Sometimes we work the whole day. After some three hours or so, not before, Mikhail Sergeyevich asks: "Shall we not break off here?" If this coincides with lunchtime, we cross to the restaurant in the same building. Lunch I would term very modest, but it could also be called normal.

The meetings usually begin with a speech from the president, who puts to the council some issues or other,

formulating the subject of the discussion: "I have to make a decision, let us therefore exchange opinions." No one asks leave to speak, no one writes down questions. There is no strict order of priority of the speeches. If a person wishes to say something, he does so. There are, naturally, various, at times polar-opposite, opinions. It is possible to interject and to ask a speaker to explain his position. There is no time limit, and one may speak a second time on a given issue if necessary.

[Yevseyev] And who is the most active at the meetings?

[Osipyan] I could not, perhaps, name such a person. There has yet to be an issue on which not everyone has had a say.

[Yevseyev] Problems of science have not been discussed yet?

[Osipyan] No.

[Yevseyev] Were there to be such a discussion. What would you say in the council?

[Osipyan] That our science, however odd this sounds, is one of the most fortunate spheres of activity in the country. The crisis which has afflicted society has afflicted it also, of course, but, nonetheless, to a lesser extent than other spheres of activity....

[Yevseyev] You evaluate the situation thus despite the fact that we already lag behind not only in the introduction of our scientific achievements but in the achievements themselves? In basic science included?

[Osipyan] I would not put it so categorically: "Already lag behind". As if we did not lag behind previously.... As before, now also we are working approximately the same "hours." But world science has moved ahead very strongly. Nor, furthermore, do all our problems when it comes to introduction pertain to science. This is an old argument, however, and I have my own ideas here, which, unfortunately, far from all share. Science and technology are different things and should be exercised differently also, according to their aims, tasks and methods. Science is the extraction of knowledge, technology is the use of this knowledge. In order to extract knowledge one system of organization is needed, but to use it, quite another. But we mix everything together, on account of which incompetent decisions and all kinds of confusion emerge. As far as the actual word "introduction" is concerned, we simply need to abolish it—there can be no artificial, forcible "introduction." Everything must proceed of its own accord, naturally. The economy must be allowed to stimulate its mechanism of acceptance of the achievements of science and technology itself, constantly upgrading production. It is already clear to us that all this is possible only under the conditions of a market economy. And we are now moving toward it. Although, as before, we still understand "introduction" as fulfillment of the corresponding decisions of the corresponding authorities. So the author

of this decision goes around the departments and "introduces" it in practice.... Everything is stood on its head! The situation is utterly senseless.

[Yevseyev] But what, for all that, is happening with our basic science?

[Osipyan] Its rating is still quite high. For this there is one very characteristic indicator: As soon as the prohibitions on all kinds of exit and transit eased here, the world immediately demonstrated tremendous demand for our scientists. They are eagerly being invited to work in various countries—the United States, Britain, France—being considered highly qualified, gifted, and industrious people. But, this being the case, it would be unreasonable to conclude that although all scientific associates in the USSR have attained a particular level, science itself here is poor. All this gives us hope that things are, after all, not all that bad here in science.

[Yevseyev] Are you not put on your guard by the fact that big "supply" also is corresponding to the big "demand" for our scientists?

[Osipyan] I'll say, it is, of course! I believe that the flow of scientists which has moved to the West is yet another national problem of ours. We need to seek some solutions urgently. On the one hand so as to prevent such a mass movement to the West and, conversely, to ensure that the flow heads toward us. But we must under no circumstances here cut short the aspiration of our scientists to travel to other countries because science is international, and exchanges of scientists and ideas are absolutely necessary. But nor can we go to extremes either—if the movement to the West continues at the same pace, there will soon, I feel, simply be no one left to work in our institutes and laboratories. This would be a blow not only to the present but also the future of the country: The school of science not only "issues" new products, it raises and creates new generations of scientists.

[Yevseyev] Do you know what characteristic trait of yours is cited primarily by your friends?

[Osipyan] No, of course not. But I can guess.... Although.... I will not guess. It is best that you say.

[Yevseyev] Common sense.... An old word. Not much in use today....

[Osipyan] Thank you. It is nice to hear. I consider common sense a very important and progressive quality. If we had more common sense in all fields of activity, it would only be to everyone's benefit....

Ligachev Interviewed on Concept of Market Reform

*LD2905221190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 29 May 90*

["Topical Interview" with Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, CPSU Politburo member and Central Committee secretary, by unidentified radio reporter on 29 May, place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Reporter] Yegor Kuzmich, let us, perhaps, begin talking about the market economy. It is on everyone's lips today and, unfortunately, has maybe not prompted an appropriate reaction. You are a Politburo member. What are the tasks facing Communists in conveying the meaning of this transition, proposed transition, to a market economy?

[Ligachev] First of all, I should like to say that I am for a socialist market. The issues of prices and unemployment are very important, but forms of ownership, the type of ownership, are the basis of any market. When people speak of a free market, that means that private ownership of the means of production is its basis. When we talk about a socialist market, that means that its basis is socialist ownership, public ownership of the means of production—I should like to stress, in all its diverse forms and forms of management, including state, collective, leasehold, cooperative....

[Reporter, interrupting] Joint-stock.

[Ligachev] ...individual, joint-stock, and so on. But, all the same, that is the basis of public ownership of the means of production.

Second, when I speak of the socialist market I also mean, first and foremost, a combination of the principle of the plan with commodity-money relations, the commodity-money economy. It is the plan which, I feel, should determine the main proportions of the development of the national economy and the economic stimulants—I would say regulators—of market and commodity-money relations. I am in favor of there definitely being, come what may, guaranteed prices for basic consumer goods....

[Reporter, interrupting] State prices?

[Ligachev] Yes, state prices, and, without fail, guarantees against mass unemployment. No manner of material riches here, if they can be called that, can replace a person's need to engage in social production and the satisfaction of that need.

The measures for the transition to a regulated market economy have not yet been examined in the party's Central Committee. I feel that the party must be involved without delay both in the elaboration of these measures and especially in their implementation, of course. I feel that the implementation of any kind of profound reforms is completely impossible without the ruling party, which is the Communist Party. All sorts of attempts to bypass the party and leave it somewhere on the sidelines are simply illusory, for under our system the party plays the leading role, especially in matters related to explaining the essence of our policy to the people. You will agree that even the very best policy is condemned to failure if it is not understood by the people.

Ligachev, Medvedev Address Editors' Course

PM2905124590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Journalists Study"]

[Text] Studies for editors of republic, kray, and oblast party newspapers have ended at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Institute for Improving the Qualifications of Leading Cadres. Attention centered on problems in the work of the party press in conditions of perestroika.

The students displayed a lively interest in the lectures, discussions, and seminars on problems of the renewal of the CPSU during the pre-congress debate and preparation for the 28th Congress, the country's transition to a regulated market, the formation of a rule-of-law state and the strengthening of socialist legality, social and national policy, and parliamentary journalism and in the exchange of experience of the work of party publications and journalists in conditions of political struggle. The political and ideological processes taking place in society, the resultant problems and contradictions, and the role of the mass media in the spiritual and moral renewal of society in conditions of political pluralism were analyzed.

An important place in the lectures was devoted to improving the structure of the press and newspaper production, to questions of financial and commercial activity, and to eliminating the obsolete instructions and statutes that curb this work.

The students discussed the tasks of the local party press stemming from the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Newspaper PRAVDA," which proposed a program to increase the efficiency of the party press' work at the current phase of perestroika.

The following addressed the journalists: Ye.K. Ligachev and V.A. Medvedev, members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and PRAVDA chief editor; I.D. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and chairman of the USSR Union of Journalists; N.Ye. Kruchina, CPSU Central Committee administrator of affairs; Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom [city committee] and member of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau; N. Belyayev and V.M. Minin, deputy chairmen of USSR Supreme Soviet committees; A.A. Maslennikov, chief of the USSR President's Press Service; V.I. Shcherbakov and G.A. Yagodin, chairmen of USSR state committees; I.N. Denisov, USSR minister; V.A. Mikhaylov, G.V. Pryakhin, and A.A. Sazonov, deputy chiefs of CPSU Central Committee departments; S.A. Smirnov, secretary of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee; O.R. Latsis, first deputy chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST; senior officials from the CPSU

Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and central departments; and eminent scientists and journalists.

Nishanov Discusses Nationalities Legislation

PM3005092990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 May 90 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, by own correspondent A. Gorbato: "New Federation, New Relations"—date and place unspecified, first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet recently adopted laws defining the foundations of the development of inter-ethnic relations in our country. The importance of the adopted documents and further ways of improving the entire federation were discussed by a PRAVDA correspondent and Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities.

[Gorbato] How can we assess, as a whole, the laws adopted by the Supreme Soviet?

[Nishanov] A number of them presuppose changes to the country's Constitution, which will be submitted to the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies for ratification. But it is already obvious that yet another, and important, step has been taken along the road of improving the Soviet federation. It is also of fundamental importance that we have succeeded in adopting these laws as a package covering the most important aspects of national building.

The Supreme Soviet discussion was profound and fruitful. It demonstrated yet again that we have made the principle of the all-around expansion of the powers and independence of all national-territorial formations—from union republics to national okrugs—the basis of our lawmaking activity. This line is clearly visible in any of the adopted laws. They wholly accord with the demands of the strategy elaborated by the country's supreme organ, which has set itself the goal of dismantling the existing supercentralism and resolutely rejecting the legacy of Stalinism in the state system.

[Gorbato] Remind us: What laws are included in this package?

[Nishanov] First and foremost, there is the law "On the Delimitation of Powers Between the USSR and Components of the Federation." I would say that the second most important is the law on the free national development of Soviet citizens living outside their national-state entities or lacking such entities on the country's territory. The law on the languages of Soviet peoples, which defines the spheres of use of Russian and the languages of native nationalities both in the union and in individual republics, is also of very great importance. During our difficult period the adoption of a law stepping up responsibility for infringing national equal rights and for

forcibly violating the unity of the USSR's territory—which will serve to unconditionally ensure equal rights for the representatives of all peoples living in the country and act as an obstacle to any negative manifestations on nationality grounds—has become highly topical.

No less important is the law on the foundations of the economic relations between the USSR and union and autonomous republics, which creates in practice the necessary economic and legal foundations for the introduction of a nationwide market. The law on the general principles of local self-government and local economic management in the USSR—which opens up an opportunity for fuller growth for the economy, culture, public education, and health care locally—is in the same rank.

And, finally, there is the law on the procedure for resolving issues connected with a union republic's secession from the USSR, which will define for the first time in the Soviet federation's history the specific ways and means of seceding from the union. In other words, the procedural implementation of the right enjoyed by all union republics under Article 72 of the Soviet Constitution is being sketched out.

Each of the adopted laws covers a wholly independent and quite definite sphere of interethnic relations. It is this approach which makes it possible to detail the legal backup for national development and to bring the political, socioeconomic, and spiritual interests of the peoples, national minorities, and even individual representatives of populations made up of other nationalities up to the level of guaranteed legal protection.

[Gorbatov] The question of the need to urgently renew the union treaty is often being raised nowadays.

[Nishanov] Yes, we need such a treaty. But a number of serious problems arise in this area.

The fact is that the 1922 treaty is still in force. Many of its provisions were reflected in the 1924, 1936, and 1977 constitutions. But, at the same time, it should be remembered that this treaty was concluded by just four republics. The others acceded later, each depending on its specific circumstances.

And if we abrogate the 1922 treaty and start drawing up a new treaty without doing any other groundwork or preparing any other mechanisms, will we be able to conclude a new treaty at all? That is why we should prepare a basis for this now, relying on our existing institutions, the USSR Constitution, and the laws we have already adopted. We saw for ourselves that this will be very difficult during the discussion in the Supreme Soviet chambers of the question of delimiting powers between the USSR and components of the federation. It has become clear that this very discussion has considerably expanded the understanding of what path we should take.

[Gorbatov] The very structure of the national-state setup has been increasingly criticized recently.

[Nishanov] I too agree that it is no longer irreproachable and should be improved. Speakers at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or the USSR Supreme Soviet often directly point this out. We have union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs, and in some places individual national rural soviets and other entities (unfortunately, many of them were scrapped by the administrative-edict method) have survived. That is why representatives of various nations constantly raise the question: Why was this structure "determined" for them? And we have already started elaborating a mechanism under which each people should feel equal, irrespective of its size. The closest attention should be paid to the problems of autonomous entities.

[Gorbatov] Rafik Nishanovich, in their letters about the problems of interethnic relations, PRAVDA readers sometimes express criticism, not least about the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet. They write that it is still notably lagging behind events which, regrettably, are often tragic.

[Nishanov] How can I respond to that? After all, we have indeed lagged behind events sometimes. At other times we have been right in the thick of things, seeing the full force of people's suffering during periods of acute outbursts of violence on nationalities grounds. After all, our Supreme Soviet—and the Soviet of Nationalities is no exception—is becoming a genuinely working body which is gradually getting a grip on the situation in the complex and often contradictory process of the development of interethnic relations.

It is my profound conviction that the package of laws mentioned earlier is precisely aimed at fundamentally changing the position in interethnic relations. To this end, difficult, painstaking, and often—I am not afraid of the word—selfless work has been done in Supreme Soviet committees and commissions.

Doesn't this mean that, by adopting laws which are undoubtedly progressive, timely, and highly necessary for our country's peoples, we have thereby, as it were, already resolved the entire highly complex range of the problems of both nationalities development and interethnic relations? Of course not. So far only the groundwork has been done, the legal foundations have been laid, but the edifice itself needs to be erected through the joint efforts of central and local organs of state power. And this process should be managed.

What am I talking about? Primarily, about the practical issues of improving the national-state setup. And about really improving the legal status of national autonomous entities and restoring the rights of peoples who were repressed during the war and postwar years. As is well known, the Supreme Soviet has adopted a very politically important document—the declaration that the acts of repression against peoples subjected to forced resettlement were illegal and criminal, and that their rights should be ensured. People are expecting concrete change, and we must resolve these painful issues.

However, given the current organizational structure of administration centrally and locally, many of these problems seem to be divided up among ministries, departments, and territorial organs. And sometimes the problems go beyond the field of their activity.

In order to resolve in practice the urgent and long-term tasks in the sphere of national development and interethnic relations it has been deemed expedient to set up a State Committee for Nationalities Issues (the USSR Goskomnats).

[Gorbatov] Is this yet another layer of government—and one which duplicates the Soviet of Nationalities, at that?

[Nishanov] Not at all. I would recall that there used to be a People's Commissariat for Nationalities Issues in our country. The state committee reinstated today, cooperating with corresponding organs from union and autonomous republic councils of ministers and local soviets, is to ensure the practical implementation of the decisions of congresses of USSR people's deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers on questions of the equal and comprehensive development of all peoples.

In its practical work the USSR Goskomnats will cooperate with the Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations, and other USSR Supreme Soviet commissions and committees. It is planned that the members of the committee will include union republics' permanent representatives to the USSR Council of Ministers, as well as representatives of autonomous republics and other autonomous formations.

Thus, if we want to discover real causes and to control certain processes we must constantly study, forecast, and take account of the nationalities factor in our state's life at all levels—legislative and executive. How has it been taken into account hitherto? Not always properly, to put it mildly. In terms of per capita national income, for instance, today there is a threefold gap between Estonia and Tajikistan. And, regrettably, many such cases can be cited.

We realize that in our time it is impossible and short-sighted to attempt to resolve the entire complex crop of nationalities problems without making an in-depth scientific study of them. That is why there is a need to set up a scientific center at statewide level to engage in a comprehensive study of the problems of ethnic relations and to expand information work in this sphere.

Today we are essentially returning to the Leninist norms and principles in nationalities policy. In this connection we must attentively turn to the specific experience of the past. In the '20s and '30s there was a nationalities scientific research institute in our country under the USSR Central Executive Committee, and the journals *ZHIZN NATSIONALNOSTEY* and *REVOLYUTSIYA I NATSIONALNOSTI*—subsequently abolished without due cause—were published. This had a negative

impact on the development of the theory and practice of interethnic relations. Today it is extremely important to make up what has been lost.

I think that it would be purposeful to set up an all-union scientific research institute of national relations under the USSR Supreme Soviet of Nationalities and to publish a Soviet of Nationalities journal.

[Gorbatov] What would the institute study?

[Nishanov] Above all, questions of the history and theory of nations and national relations. The specific elaboration of the state, legal, and socioeconomic aspects of interethnic relations is no less important. Finally, there is the analysis of national movements, amalgamations, and associations, forecasting in this sphere, and sociological research.

The journal is envisaged as a sociopolitical monthly. It could publish theoretical articles, items drawn from the experience of soviet work, journalism, and official documents from the USSR Supreme Soviet, its commissions, union and autonomous republic Supreme Soviets, and local soviets.

[Gorbatov] As is well known, certain sittings of the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet on the most acute problems of interethnic relations have not been transmitted recently. There have also been closed sittings. Various arguments are sometimes expressed on this score...

[Nishanov] You know that all decisions are made in accordance with the standing orders and on the basis of a vote. So we should not envisage either an attack on glasnost or the winding up of democracy in this area. If in certain parts of the country feelings are running high or even worse—if blood is being shed—we cannot allow any imprudent word or even gesture to lead to new suffering or new casualties. The main thing in this situation is to make the right decision, find the way to compromise, and undoubtedly always publicize the decisions we reach. There should be no secrets about this.

In general, the abiding principle behind all the work of the Supreme Soviet and the Soviet of Nationalities should be Lenin's idea that only great attentiveness to the interests of different nations will remove any grounds for conflict, eradicate possible distrust, and banish the fear of any intrigues.

If we follow this principle everywhere and in everything life in our immense multinational home will be better and more civilized. And this means that we will all live better.

Leader of Democratic Platform Interviewed

LD2905082890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
2300 GMT 28 May 90

[Interview with (Vladimir Vysenko), leader of the Democratic Platform of the CPSU, by correspondent Kirill Shakhnovich, in Moscow, date not given—recorded]

[Text] The second regional conference of supporters of the Democratic Platform of the CPSU has ended its work in Moscow. Its task is to work out tactics and to adopt the basic documents of an all-union conference of the Democratic Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress.

Our correspondent Kirill Shakhnovich met with (Vladimir Vysenko), the leader of this organization.

[Begin recording] [Shakhnovich] Vladimir Nikolayev, the Democratic Platform stands before three roads. There is the proposal to withdraw from the ranks of the CPSU and to join the Democratic Party. Another option is to remain in the CPSU as before, and to try by a long evolved means to continue work on the reformation of the CPSU. And the third option is your own. As I understand it, your option is, to a certain extent, to assimilate these two trends?

[(Vysenko)] We believe that we should go to the 28th CPSU Congress well prepared with our alternative documents setting out our concept of a parliamentary-type party based on fundamentally different bases than today's. In the event that the Democratic Platform, having made its statement and waged a struggle for its documents, does not receive the support of the majority of delegates, I think that, on behalf of our faction or our delegation, we shall declare the collective withdrawal of the supporters of the Democratic Forum from the CPSU, and we shall call upon all the communists in the country to support our initiative and get down to setting up a new political party which will truly stand and be based on democratic principles.

[Shakhnovich] People today say that there are many, many unpredictable things going on. And here we have another option—the existence of Communist Parties of Moldavia, Georgia, and the Baltic Republics who could have their own reaction at the Congress. Is there the possibility of consolidation among them?

[(Vysenko)] Indeed, we have invited the delegations of the independent Communist parties of the Baltic republics to the all-union second conference of the Democratic Platform in Moscow on 16-17 June. We have also sent proposals to Georgia and Moldavia. And they are currently expressing their solidarity with the Democratic Platform and are ready in the future, if there are no radical changes in the CPSU, to work precisely jointly with the Democratic Platform and, together with it, to build some kind of alliance of future political democratic parties standing on the values of socialism and democracy, but rejecting a totalitarian type of party.

[Shakhnovich] Can you formulate those proposals which you will take with you to the congress?

[(Vysenko)] These are a rejection of communism as an objective of the CPSU and, accordingly, a change in the name of the party—I propose a Party of Democratic Socialism; a rejection of the monopoly of one dialogue. It should be based on the whole wealth of socialist, humanistic and democratic thought. Further, I believe that the

party should, in fact, reject a monopoly of power over the mass media, having rejected democratic centralism and the territorial-production principle, and having liquidated the nomenclature system. And, finally, the party should become an alliance of independent parties of different republics. Only in this way is realistic progress possible.

[Shakhnovich] How realistic do you think these proposals are?

[(Vysenko)] I think that they are just a few percent, our chances (?are reasonable).

[Shakhnovich] Thank you, we hope you get the chance.

[(Vysenko)] Thank you. [end recording]

Democratic Platform Comes Out Against Split

WA2905191190 Moscow TRUD in Russian
28 Apr 90 p 4

[Letter to editor from A. Gakayev, with response by V. Shostakovskiy, member of the Coordinating Council of the CPSU Democratic Platform: "The All-Union Conference Will Decide"]

[Text] We hear that the "CPSU Democratic Platform" adherents intend to create their own party. Is this true? What actually is the "Democratic Platform" we see today? Is it a faction, some kind of organization, or the embryo of a new party?

[Signed] A. Gakayev. City of Grosnyy

Response by V. Shostakovskiy, rector of the Moscow Higher Party School and member of the Coordinating Council of the "CPSU Democratic Platform."

The "Democratic Platform" is rather a stream or, if you will, the left wing of the CPSU. It emerged "from below" as a movement of Communists oriented towards effecting radical transformation of the party. This was, and is presently, at the foundation of "Democratic Platform's" activity.

Today our supporters number in the several hundreds of thousands, including about 60,000 people in Moscow and Leningrad. We also have sympathizers in the apparatus of the Central Committee. "Democratic Platform" is headed by a Coordinating Council of 57 individuals. This council is sometimes called virtually a prototype of a future Central Committee, but this is radically untrue. First of all, we do not ascribe any broad powers to ourselves; and secondly, we do not have the right to make independent decisions—we just coordinate and advise.

As far as the talk on creating our own party is concerned, this is based entirely on the statements of certain people. But most of us are against a split. In any case, the fate of "Democratic Platform" can only be decided by the all-union conference we are planning to conduct in the second half of May.

Aeroflot's Problems, Shortcomings Highlighted

*PM2805150790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 24 May 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast: L. Stroykov and O. Ivanov reportage from Khabarovsk aircraft factory]

[Text] [Announcer] There was a time when the word Aeroflot was associated in our country—and not without foundation—with the concepts of reliability, precision, and safety. Now associations of this kind do not come to mind. Our civil aviation is going through bad times. There are many reasons for this phenomenon, but some of the most serious ones reside in the hopeless state of the equipment. In the opinion of specialists, more than 60 percent of the aircraft fleet is suffering from wear and tear. There are shortages of aircraft, there are shortages of engines for them. Consequently, 15-20 million people are unable to obtain airline tickets each year. A new USSR minister of civil aviation was appointed a month ago—Boris Yegorovich Panyukov. Articles in the press intimate that Comrade Panyukov reckons that the situation can be rectified by the immediate conversion of aviation plants to civil aviation. But we know that conversion takes time—and a considerable amount of time at that. And millions of people want to fly today. It cannot be said that all aviation workers have pinned their hopes on conversion and are idly sitting by. Specialists are also seeking other opportunities to somehow change the situation for the better and—this is the main point—they are finding them. But, as has been the custom in our country, enthusiasts are not only not encouraged by the Ministry of Civil Aviation, they are actually opposed.

[Stroykov] [video shows aircraft factory, men working on aircraft engines]. Aviation specialists in Khabarovsk were the first in the country to invent and introduce the technology to prolong the in-service time of Il-62 engines between overhauls. It is the main longhaul aircraft here. The technology proved to be so successful that it received full approval and support from the general designer of the engines. The Ministry of Civil Aviation also gave its support, and then punished the enterprising workers. Today the engines—which are, I stress, earmarked, according to the plan, for aviation workers in the Far East—are being handed over to other administrations. Meanwhile one-third of aircraft in Khabarovsk stand idle.

[Video shows V.I. Skrypnik, chief of Far East Civil Aviation Administration, speaking facing the camera] An emergency situation has developed today within the Far East Civil Aviation Administration with regard to air transportation for the population of the Far East. I am calling it an emergency because the failure to supply the Far East Administration with 30 engines according to plan will lead to the cancellation of 364 flights in the near future. I believe that the Ministry of Civil Aviation must respond to this emergency situation by taking emergency measures today. Not merely the fair distribution of resources in order to ensure air transportation,

but priority distribution of those resources for the Far East too. Because the Far East is an area that must not hear the word "quota" either for fuel or for equipment despite the complex conditions that both the country and the sector as a whole are experiencing.

[Stroykov] [video shows people in line on tarmac at Khabarovsk Airport by aircraft] Flight cancellations mean that 60,000 people from cities in the Far East will be bombarding—as has already happened—airports and ispolkoms [soviet executive committees] with fair demands for Aeroflot and the government.

Flaws Exist in AIDS Prevention Campaign

*LD2605095190 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT
24 May 90*

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—While noting that the number of AIDS and HIV sufferers has been relatively small in the Soviet Union, some Soviet newspapers point to serious flaws in the AIDS prevention campaign.

Having recalled that there are approximately 10 million virus carriers worldwide who have no symptoms, Mikhail Narkevich, chief of the main epidemiological department of the USSR Health Ministry, said the Soviet Union's first AIDS victim was detected three years ago. He said their number now stands at 482, half of them children. Nineteen out of 29 people with fully blown cases of AIDS dies.

Scientists project the number of virus carriers by the end of the year at more than 1,600, Narkevich said. Their number in a year will be about 5,000, in two years more than 24,000, and in three years some 90,000.

The Soviet Union has 812 laboratories for diagnosing AIDS. They help examine all donors of blood, and other biological liquids and tissues, risk groups (homosexuals, bisexuals, prostitutes and, drug addicts), people returning home after long spells abroad, pregnant women and sick people with symptoms. More than 50 million people have been examined over the past two and a half years.

At the same time, Narkevich admitted, there are medical institutions in the country where the sanitary-hygienic situation leaves much to be desired. He urged stepping up anti-AIDS campaign and coordinating efforts at all levels, both at home and abroad.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA draws attention to the lack of sufficient safeguards to prevent AIDS, primarily among children, in the Volgograd region (the lower Volga region). On March 1, 1990, 49 HIV-infected children were found in Volgograd and the region. The newspaper criticises nurses who use the same syringe for several injections and points to the dire shortage of disposable syringes and other specialised modern equipment.

Weekly Supplement on Glasnost To Be Published*LD2605091890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0833 GMT 24 May 90*

[Excerpts] Moscow, 24 May (TASS)—The fifth issue of the IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS has been published and is being sent out to subscribers. It opens with information about the work of the party Central Committee in April. At the center of this work were preparations for the 28th party congress, getting pre-congress discussion underway and the consolidation of party ranks. [passage omitted]

June of this year will see the first issue of an information supplement to the IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS journal—a weekly entitled “GLASNOST: INFORMATION, VIEWS, COMMENTARIES”. It will publish answers to questions that come in to the Central Committee from Communists and working people; topical sociopolitical information; comments on party decisions and more importantly, events in the life of the party, in the country and abroad; and analytical reviews. The weekly will be published by the CPSU Central Committee PRAVDA publishing house on eight pages and will be half the format of the PRAVDA newspaper.

Distribution is being organized by subscription and also via retail sales.

Residents Polled on Transition to Market Economy*LD2605100790 Moscow in English to Great Britain
and Ireland 1900 GMT 24 May 90*

[Text] People in 11 Soviet regions have been polled on the prospects of transition to a regulated market economy. Slightly over 50 percent supported the transition; two-thirds of that group should like it to be steady and painless; thirty-seven percent regard market relations as a way to renew socialism. An equal share fear the country may borrow the worst from capitalism and socialism. Less than one-half of the polled are certain that the government will check the deterioration of their living standards.

Economic**Defense Plant Converts to Consumer Production***PM2805142590 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 20 May 90*

[From the “Vremya” newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The fate of this plant was unexpected, but, in our day and age, natural. [video shows picture of toy tank and electronic game]

[Reporter] We deliberately placed this piece of military equipment (albeit for children to play with) and this new children's electronic toy side by side. Yesterday and today. They are, if you like, symbolic and a good present-day sign—conversion. “Meteor”—that is the name of the new enterprise, part of the “Izhevskiy Elektromekhanicheskiy Zavod” Association, one of the leading associations in

Udmurtia—certainly did not intend to produce specialized toys. But the excellent technological and design potential was oriented to precisely this purpose. And now there has been an abrupt turnabout. Goods were produced by the association before, of course, but in terribly small quantities.

[Video shows E.V. Tyulpin, general director of the “Izhevskiy Elektromekhanicheskiy Zavod” Association]

[Tyulpin] You're right. We produce consumer goods worth 10 million rubles [R]. For an enterprise like ours that's very, very inadequate. The range of goods isn't gratifying either. In 1988 we made a decision—and this was backed by the ministry—to convert our association's “Meteor” instrument plant to produce consumer goods and medical equipment. This equipment is mainly the “Infita” device. Its readings can be used to treat asthmatic conditions, cardiovascular conditions, and hypertension.

[Reporter] “Infita” which, in time, will be not just a piece of clinical equipment but an entirely domestic piece of medical equipment as well, has already entered production. Just like, incidentally, the children's electronic toys instead of the old tanks. The association is preparing other innovations too. For instance, such cleverly thought-out items as a gas-stove lighter which, using an adapter, unexpectedly turns into a device for checking the condition of car spark plugs. Or take this hand-held hemming machine. The enterprise's shops will soon be producing microwave ovens in their thousands as well, like this one or more sophisticated ones. In short, in the very near future production of goods—and competitive goods too—at the association will increase tenfold to reach R100 million a year. Other defense complex plants located in Udmurtia are already accounting for a notable proportion of consumer goods. Admittedly, it is a pity that the conversion is not being conducted as quickly as one would like. Given the current paucity of goods on the consumer market, such an important matter could, of course, be expedited by a law on conversion.

Some Collective Farm Members Reject Leaseholding*PM2905160190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 25 May 90*

[From the “Vremya” newscast: A. Bardo, N. Osipov reportage from Pobeda collective farm, Baleyiskiy Rayon, Chita Oblast]

[Text] [Announcer] Who will ultimately take charge of the land in our country? Will it be the peasant-farmer [fermer], lessee, collective farm [kolkhoz], or state farm [sovkhoz]? And what is preferable from the viewpoint of rural economics? An answer to these questions is provided in reportage from the Pobeda kolkhoz in Baleyiskiy Rayon, Chita Oblast.

[V.S. Kalinin, head of a dairy complex] [video shows Kalinin against a backdrop of farmland] Let the peasant decide himself how he wants to work. Let there be leasing collectives and private enterprise side by side

with kolkhozes. There is no need to tell agricultural workers what is best for them. Take our farm, for instance. It is one of the leading farms in our rayon.

[Reporter] [video shows well-appointed houses] The kolkhoz spends around 1 million rubles [R] annually on construction. It does not receive a kopek from the state. Nor has it ever received any money in the 40 years that it has been in existence. Despite that, it has managed to survive mergers, incorporation of laggard kolkhozes, and other kind of experiments. However, the kolkhoz members have managed to stand their ground and not to lose their peasant common sense. They have even managed to keep intact a herd of horses [video shows horses] without which it is impossible to manage here in the hills. Although as regards machinery, they are not doing badly either on the Pobeda farm.

Grain and feed crop sowing is currently under way. [video shows machines in fields] For the first time this year the farm will not have to comply with a grain procurement plan handed down from above. Only surplus grain will be sold. The farm's feed requirement will also be met in full from own resources. Before this, tens of tonnes of feed and hay had to be bought elsewhere.

We talked to the kolkhoz members about many things. We asked them about the way they live and work, and not one of them complained about his lot. It would be sinful, considering that average monthly wages here total R450. In addition everyone has a personal plot and his own livestock, of course. However, when the conversation turned to leasing, everyone was against it, and the arguments that were cited were quite weighty.

[I.G. Gordeyev, a machine operator] Prices have risen: prices for lubricants, prices for fertilizers, prices for everything that farmers need. We have not raised prices for our output once since 1917, (?that was the last increase).

[Reporter] What about livestock raising?

[P.P. Davidyuk, another machine operator] We won't manage. We do not have the necessary facilities. We won't be able to cut enough hay for more than one or two cows at the most.

[Reporter] It remains for me to add that the Pobeda Kolkhoz is planning to make a net profit of around R2 million this year.

Ship Unloading Delays, Railcar Shortage Reported

PM2905144390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 25 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: O. Padenko, L. Borisenko reportage from Vladivostok]

[Text] [Announcer] We often hear alarming reports about food shortages in our country. The problems posed by shortages are dealt with partially by purchases of food abroad. However, we have received an alarm signal from

our correspondent in Vladivostok. Vast amounts of food from Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and Vietnam have piled up at ports in the Far East.

[Padenko] [video shows row of ships at docks] Nothing like this has happened for a long time at the Pacific berthing lines. Seven large refrigerator ships, two of them foreign, are moored here, loaded to capacity with meat, butter, and fruit, and no one is unloading them. This food is earmarked for many destinations in the country; yet you get the impression that it is not needed, that our stores are full of lamb, butter and oil, and apples and bananas. That there are no shortages of them.

[G.I. Pikus, deputy chief of Far East Shipping Line] I can cite you a very striking example. The MS Komsomolets Primorya has been in the port of Magadan since 27 April. Half the meat onboard has been unloaded. The other half is still on the ship. And what is most amazing is that nothing is being done to resolve the issue. The ship has been moved to the roadstead. There are no plans to unload it. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Trade and the Far East Office of the "Rossmyasomoltorg" to whom the freight belongs are haggling about where the freight should be unloaded—Magadan or Kamchatka.

[Padenko] But ships are waiting to be unloaded here too, both in Vladivostok and in Nakhodka.

[Pikus] Yes, in Vladivostok and Nakhodka. Unloading is progressing very slowly and the reason is always the same—shortages of freight cars, freight cars, and refrigerated freight cars again. Our transport ministries, the Ministry of Railways, the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, and the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet, are to blame for having accepted substantial quantities of goods for export which have not been planned, which are not sold, and in respect of which various customs questions remain unresolved. The railroad is chockablock with such goods. The number of freight cars currently en route is 50 percent above the norm. And the delivery of freight cars that are available to take the aforementioned meat and butter is causing great difficulties. [video shows railroad lines blocked with freight cars].

[Padenko] Meanwhile the ships are marooned?

[Pikus] The ships are marooned.

[Padenko] This means that the inhabitants of the Far East, Siberia, and the Urals will have to wait for some time yet for the food bought from our Western neighbors. In this situation, will the foreign currency losses be the only losses which we sustain?

*Savings Withdrawals Linked to Instability

904A0378A Moscow EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN
in Russian No 21, May 90 p 2

[Report by USSR Goskomstat: "Political Escape from Money"]

[Text] The crisis phenomena in the economy are continuing to increase. There are many things to confirm

this. And here is what is typical. It is becoming increasingly obvious with each day that the political situation in the country is having a significant influence on the dynamics of the economic processes. Let us take just one example—deposits in savings banks. The instability of the political life in the Baltic republic is

leading to a withdrawal of money deposits. The conclusion is being confirmed that "political escape from money" is intensifying the pressure of money supply on the imbalanced consumer market and is pushing toward an aggravation of the economic crisis and inflationary processes.

**Population's Funds in Deposits and Sale of Certificates at Institutions of the USSR Savings Bank in First Quarter 1990
(in millions of rubles)**

Republic	Total Population's Funds Brought in as of 1 Apr 90	Including		In Percentage of 1 Apr 89 Figure
		In Deposits	Certificates Sold	
USSR	13,958.8	13,487.4	471.4	121.9
RSFSR	7,961.9	7,874.5	87.4	120.6
Ukrainian SSR	2,717.1	2,681.0	36.1	140.1
Belorussian SSR	595.6	594.4	1.2	125.4
Uzbek SSR	403.6	361.8	41.8	149.0
Kazakh SSR	555.2	520.2	35.0	124.8
Georgian SSR	610.1	523.5	86.6	2.3-fold
Azerbaijan SSR	215.4	129.6	85.8	2.9-fold
Lithuanian SSR	-7.3	-10.2	2.9	-
Moldavian SSR	285.7	280.8	4.9	159.8
Latvian SSR	26.9	25.7	1.2	33.9
Kirghiz SSR	95.5	90.6	4.9	142.9
Tajik SSR	84.9	77.6	7.3	102.8
Armenian SSR	267.3	210.2	57.1	39.4
Turkmen SSR	143.3	134.6	8.7	152.3
Estonian SSR	3.6	-6.9	10.5	7.8

Agricultural

Kremlin Meeting on Agricultural Priorities Noted

PM2905102549 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by V. Gavrichkin: "What Are the Countryside's Priority Needs"]

[Text] It could be said that a "grand consultation" took place in the Kremlin concerning the state of affairs in the agrarian sector and the problems of switching to a mixed economy and developing new forms of economic management in the countryside.

The state of our agricultural production cannot fail to cause concern. The half-empty shelves in food stores convey this more eloquently than any words. The discrepancy between prices for industrial and agricultural output continues to increase. The social neglect of the countryside has become intolerable. And the main concern is that the very important laws adopted recently on land and ownership and on leasing and lease relations are still not working. Why? What should be done to extricate our agriculture from the crisis? The problem is very topical. Its solution is the first step to improving our economy.

This is why the priorities which should be given to the countryside in order to extricate it from today's situation was a key question during the meeting.

The opinion was affirmed (many deputies representing agrarian workers, it should be said, actively support it) that there is only one way that the backwardness in the countryside can be remedied: Switch all the country's resources to the agrarian sector for a while, rectify at a stroke the lack of social amenities in the countryside, and the rest, they say, will follow.

It will not! That clear conclusion emerged from the course of the entire discussion. Of course the countryside needs resources. But they are not the only concern. The time for simple solutions has passed. The new masters—individual farmers, lessees, and cooperatives—who spoke at the meeting proved this particularly convincingly. Though they enjoy the same, and often far worse, opportunities and are constantly forced to overcome the stout resistance of those opposed to the radical agrarian transformations, they demonstrate twice, five times, and often 10 times the efficiency of the kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] around them.

This is a significant fact in all respects. We have no shortage of areas in the country where the countryside

enjoys relatively good amenities, but even there productivity is low. Plenty of funds have been poured, for instance, into the development of the Non-Chernozem Zone, but they weren't spent on what was needed and fell into the hands of people who were not interested in the result, people who were not masters. And as a result of extensive, extremely irrational management we have been forced to spread our agriculture over a huge area and to use our natural resources uneconomically, which leads to major new losses.

Of course, it is difficult for the independent master, whether individual farmer, lessee, or agricultural cooperative, to survive alone. And he shouldn't have to. The present kolkhozes and sovkhazes are a good base for forming associations of free peasants and lease collectives. Today many farms are being transformed into this kind of association and peasants are becoming co-owners of the means of production or shareholders, and on this basis economic formations are getting a second wind, as it were. Life itself is suggesting the best forms of organization.

"We are not against kolkhozes and sovkhazes, but they are useless in their present form. The system should work, not the chairman," said P. Naumov, a lessee from Novosibirsk Oblast.

And it is necessary to single out three really important priorities to ensure that the system really works. These are the transformation of economic relations and the master's return to the land, the provision of social amenities in the countryside, and scientific and technical progress. And of these the main priority is, of course, the first. **Only a peasant-master freed from all administrative fetters, endowed with land and ownership, and honored as the key figure in society—only he is capable of feeding the country.** This conclusion was drawn on the eve of the Presidential Council session which will discuss in detail urgent measures to overcome the agricultural crisis and the concept of land reform in the country.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Agrarian Committee has been instructed to prepare a draft decree which is meant to put an end to disregard of the Law on Land.

Outbreak of Cattle Disease Reported in Kazakhstan

PM2905122190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 May 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by S. Suslikov: "Epidemic Was Not Successfully Concealed"]

[Text] North Kazakhstan Oblast—The public of North Kazakhstan Oblast is demanding that the entire oblast be declared an ecological and epidemiological disaster zone. A group of deputies has suggested that this question be submitted for examination by the next session of the oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

It has emerged that virtually all the republic's sick large-horned cattle were concentrated in the prosperous

order-bearing oblast. That is one-third of the country's livestock [as published]. Specialists' conclusions come down to one thing: the extraordinary situation which has taken shape with regard to brucellosis and tuberculosis in North Kazakhstan should be regarded as an ecological catastrophe. It is a case of hundreds of thousands of diseased agricultural and wild animals and unusual anomalies which have arisen in livestock raising and which threaten man's health. Losses in the oblast's economy are already reaching 100-150 million rubles a year. According to preliminary estimates they will almost double with the transfer to meat and milk procurements under the new state standard.

"The situation which has taken shape is the result of the aspiration to make out that what is desired is reality," said S. Medvedev, chairman of the North Kazakhstan Oblast Soviet. "People have been working with sick livestock with a risk to their health for decades and do not even receive danger allowances because livestock with tuberculosis are not supposed to exist at the stock-raising units. According to existing instructions these livestock should be slaughtered immediately. But tell me how you can slaughter livestock and at the same time fulfill or even overfulfill the stepped-up plans and socialist pledges issued from above. The result was that, standing on the edge of the abyss, they sent victorious reports to their superiors and received orders and stars as Heroes of Labor..."

How to struggle against the disaster now? In the opinion of S. Medvedev again, the first thing is to stop deceiving people. It is extraordinarily difficult to do this even under the conditions of glasnost.

"In America," oblast soviet Deputy L. Pleshakov said, "when they encountered similar problems they decided to burn the old stockraising units together with the sick livestock and to construct new units and bring in healthy livestock. This option was the cheapest, and the expense was recouped instantly. The logic is different in our country. The government allocated only crumbs for the livestock's recovery and immediately increased the plans for milk deliveries to union-republic stocks by 25,000 tonnes, thus obliging the livestock raisers to build up the production of milk which, according to the USSR veterinary charger, should be processed into pot butter. But... the milk has been released for sale year after year, and the consumer has been receiving dangerous food. Why? We deputies decided to put the question point-blank right now because it will have to be answered anyway. People will ask..."

There is no disputing that even a republic does not have the forces to replace virtually all its livestock. In the opinion of specialists, to overcome the crisis situation this problem must be given state and social importance, and special services and material and manpower resources must be enlisted. Such a comprehensive solution is possible right now if the USSR Council of Ministers state commission for emergency situations engages in this problem. With great powers and the

necessary forces and funds, the commission will be able to pool the efforts of union and republican organs, ministries and departments, and public organizations in the struggle against socially dangerous diseases—brucellosis and tuberculosis.

But in the meantime the epidemic is surreptitiously creeping beyond the oblast.

Scientific

'Resurs-F' Photographic Satellite Launched 29 May
LD2905175390 Moscow TASS in English 1746 GMT
29 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The Soviet Union launched the artificial earth satellite Resurs-F with the help of the Soyuz booster rocket today.

The satellite carries equipment designed for multizonal and spectrozonal photography to continue the exploration of the earth's natural resources in the interests of various branches of the Soviet economy and the accomplishment of ecological and international cooperation tasks.

The satellite was put into an orbit with the following parameters:

- Initial period of revolution—88.7 minutes
- Maximum distance from the earth's surface (apogee)—260 kilometers
- Minimum distance from the earth's surface (perigee)—190 kilometers
- Orbit inclination—82.3 degrees.

The equipment installed on the satellite is operating normally. Upon the completion of the flight, the exposed film will be transferred to the Priroda State Research and Production Centre for processing and the subsequent distribution of the obtained information among consumers.

Under a commercial agreement, the Resurs-F satellite also carries scientific equipment of the Federal Republic of Germany, designed to conduct biotechnical experiments in conditions of micro-gravitation conditions.

AIDS Conference Opens in Leningrad

LD2905102690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1641 GMT 28 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Krupenik]

[Summary] Leningrad, 28 May (TASS)—A conference on countering AIDS, organized by the USSR Ministry of Health and the Pasteur Institute of Epidemiology and Microbiology in Leningrad, opened here today. It was opened by Professor Mikhail Narkevich, head of the Main Epidemiological Directorate, who recalled that the first AIDS case was registered three years ago. The

number of cases now stands at 317, and forecasts indicate that, if the current trend continues, the figure by the year 2000 could be over 1 million.

There are some 800 specialized laboratories in the country at present, with plans for a further 2,000. In recent years 50 million people, half of them regular blood donors, have been screened. As of 1989, a unified anti-AIDS service has been in existence, with republican and regional screening centers. The conference will also consider the psychological, ethical, juridical, and social aspects of AIDS and ways of educating the population about it.

Military

Kulikov Denies Rumors of Military Putsch

AU3005101990 Vienna DER STANDARD
in German 30 May 90 p 3

[Interview with Soviet Marshal Viktor Kulikov by George Possanner in Vienna; date not given: "Soviet Marshal in Vienna: Generals Back Gorbachev"]

[Text] [Possanner] To begin with, let me ask you a very direct political question: Do you consider it possible that based on dissatisfaction, the Soviet generals could take measures against President Mikhail Gorbachev, in other words, stage a putsch against him?

[Kulikov] I can state here clearly that the officers' corps and the generals as well as the armed forces on the whole fully and unreservedly back the president's policy—perestroika, glasnost, and pluralism. And they will defend it, too.

[Possanner] What do you think about the rumors of a putsch?

[Kulikov] They are sheer fabrication.

[Possanner] The Soviet Union has discontinued withdrawing its troops from the GDR. Why?

[Kulikov] The reintegration of officers and troops into the work process and the provision of housing are currently decelerating the withdrawal. We have committed ourselves to withdrawing 22,000 men by 1 July 1991, and we will keep to this commitment. To date, 11,620 troops have gone back. The same holds true for the situation in Hungary; however, Hungary's political leadership has not ruled out membership in NATO following our troop withdrawal.

[Possanner] What would be your comment on such a step?

[Kulikov] No one has the right to give a sovereign state directives. Personally, I would be opposed to such a step because every effort should be made to liquidate the blocs.

[Possanner] How much time do you give the two alliances?

[Kulikov] It is difficult to define the timeframe. Events in Europe and the Soviet Union are changing so rapidly. However, I do not believe that the blocs will be dissolved in the next few years.

[Possanner] Regarding the Warsaw Pact, do we not have to talk about a disintegration process?

[Kulikov] I do not use this term. We should much rather say that a number of countries intend to solve this problem in their own way. CSFR President Havel has pledged to Gorbachev that his country will maintain friendly relations between neighbors and will fulfill its military obligations within the pact.

[Possanner] The Soviet Union is militarily extremely concerned about a unified Germany. Would it not serve your security interests better to see a unified Germany bound into NATO where the United States, Moscow's most important partner in talks, has the say?

[Kulikov] No, I do not share this opinion. That would be comparable to the integration of the Bundeswehr into the Warsaw Pact.

Yazov Says Combat Readiness Affected by Cuts

LD2905105590 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1012 GMT 29 May 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Oleg Moiskovskiy]

[Text] Khabarovsk, 29 May (TASS)—Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense, who is in the Far East, has visited a number of units of the Far East Military District. He became acquainted with the progress of combat and political training and with the conditions of daily life for the servicemen.

Also today the USSR minister of defense met the command and political staff and the party aktiv of the military district. There was an open and principled conversation about ways of further renewal in the Soviet Armed Forces.

"The processes taking place in Europe and throughout the world are also having an impact on our Armed Forces," Dmitriy Yazov said in an interview to the TASS correspondent. He recalled that in accordance with the USSR's bilateral agreements with Czechoslovakia and Hungary, a stage-by-stage withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of those countries is being effected. The first phase of troop withdrawal from the CSFR finishes on 31 May. It should be completed by the middle of next year. Troop withdrawal from Mongolia, which is due to finish by the end of 1992, is also continuing. The unilateral reduction of troops announced in December 1988 is being put into effect. To date their numbers have already been reduced by 268,200.

"The reduction in the number of the armed forces cannot but affect their combat readiness," stressed the minister. "In these conditions the task is to ensure the defense sufficiency of the state by means of raising the qualitative parameters of the troops and naval forces and by optimizing the composition and structure of the armed forces."

Lizichev Meets Baltic Military District Troops

PM2905104190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 26 May 90 First Edition p 6

[Report by Colonel M. Ziyeminsh under the "Direct Line" rubric: "At the A. Matrosov Regiment"]

[Text] Baltic Military District—Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, continued his familiarization with the life and everyday activity of the Baltic Military District's servicemen when he recently visited the illustrious regiment, one of whose companies will forever include the name of Hero of the Soviet Union Private Aleksandr Matrosov. How are personnel being educated in glorious combat traditions? What concerns do the regiment's officers, warrant officers, sergeants, and soldiers have? How is the complex political situation in the Baltic republics affecting the mood of personnel? These and many other questions cropped up during many conversations and meetings in military collectives.

Many officers and warrant officers have lost all hope of obtaining accommodation, as Captain S. Kolpashchikov, battalion deputy commander for political affairs, said, for example. The rules instituted by the local authorities on this matter are such that they essentially do not apply to servicemen. As a result this regiment alone now has more than 120 officers and warrant officers without apartments.

Repeal the unlawful republic legislative acts and ensure reliable social protection for servicemen and their family members—those calls featured in the servicemen's demands.

At the "Matrosov" company's Lenin room, Army Gen. Lizichev talked with soldiers and sergeants from the subunit.

On 23 May Army Gen. Lizichev met with personnel from the Tallinn garrison.

'Tbilisi' Carrier Undergoes Performance Trials

LD2605092590 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT
24 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Skiba]

[Text] Nikolayev, Southern Ukraine May 24 TASS—The Tbilisi aircraft cruiser set off today from the berth of the Chernomorskiy Sudostroitelny Zavod production amalgamation in the city of Nikolayev and headed for

Sevastopol. The cruiser will carry out a vast programme of performance trials in the Black Sea.

The group of shipbuilders who will turn the cruiser over to the Navy are also taking part in the trials. Their

cooperation with the crew will help sailors master the sophisticated equipment rapidly, achieving a faultless performance.

After the trial programme is fulfilled, the Tbilisi aircraft cruiser will join the Soviet Navy.

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis To Travel to CSFR via Moscow

LD2905181190 Prague Domestic Service in Czech
1630 GMT 29 May 90

[Correspondent Petr Voldan report from Moscow]

[Text] According to reports from Vilnius, Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian parliament, departed by air tonight for Moscow, from where he is planning to travel to Prague tomorrow morning. As Henrikas Savickas, ELTA press agency deputy director, told me in a telephone conversation from Vilnius, he is to take part in the Day of Solidarity with Lithuania there.

This trip is Vytautas Landsbergis' very first one in his new post beyond the borders of the Baltic republics. So far he has not even been to Moscow in his capacity as chairman of Lithuanian parliament. In the Soviet capital, no meeting between Vytautas Landsbergis and Soviet official representatives has so far been planned. According to the report from the Lithuanian capital, the visit to the CSFR will take place at the invitation of President Vaclav Havel, whom the Lithuanian representative is due to meet in Prague.

Lauds Ties

LD3005104590 Prague CTK in English 0928 GMT
30 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 30 (CTK correspondent)—Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis told CTK before departure for Prague here today that relations with Czechoslovakia have always been very good and they should be even tighter.

Asked why his first foreign trip, though unofficial, in his capacity of Lithuanian parliament chairman takes him to Czechoslovakia, Vytautas Landsbergis said that the country was the first to offer—through its president—neutral soil for talks between Lithuania and the Soviet Union, a step he described as very friendly.

Landsbergis said the major problem facing Lithuania is the economic blockade from the side of Moscow, and added that his talks in Prague will be mainly political ones.

"I would like to speak about smaller countries' solidarity and about the general movement towards democracy in Central and Eastern Europe," he said.

Commenting on relations with the Soviet Union, Vytautas Landsbergis said their development is hardly predictable.

Landsbergis on Independence Declaration Suspension

AU3005080790 Paris AFP in English 0759 GMT
30 May 90

[Text] Moscow, May 30 (AFP)—Lithuania is prepared to study "suspending" or "freezing" its declaration of independence provided that this does not put it under the jurisdiction of the Soviet Constitution, Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis told AFP on Wednesday.

Questioned in the departure lounge of Sheremetyevka airport here on the possibility of suspending or freezing the act of independence, he said: "We can study and examine these various possibilities, in any case avoiding falling under the jurisdiction of the Constitution of the Soviet Union."

Mr. Landsbergis was leaving for a one-day visit to Czechoslovakia where he was due to meet President Vaclav Havel.

Vilnius Radio Carries 29 May Supreme Council

Agenda Adopted

LD2905095290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuania at 0700 GMT on 29 May begins broadcasting a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council proceedings in Vilnius. The Lithuanian Supreme Council session is chaired by Deputies Stankevicius and Abisalas.

At 0702 GMT a proposal is made by Deputy Paleckis to include in the agenda discussions on statements made by deputies to the press, or on the radio or television, which sometimes slander the government and its members. Deputy Sakalas proposes that this be discussed in a closed session. Other proposals on including various items in the agenda are made.

At 0720 GMT Deputy Stankevicius proposes that because there are many problems to discuss, a plenary sitting should be held tomorrow in the afternoon.

At 0723 GMT discussions on the agenda continue. Landsbergis thinks that agrarian reform should be debated above all. Deputy Paleckis demands that his proposals on the ethics of the deputies be included in the agenda.

At 0731 GMT the proposal by Paleckis is put to a vote. It is decided that the problem of deputies' ethics will be discussed in the Mandate and Ethics Commission.

At 0741 GMT the deputy in the chair reads today's agenda, and it is adopted:

1. Reforms in agriculture; problems and discussion. The issue is to be presented by the Agrarian Commission.

2. Minor amendments to the Law of the Lithuanian Government, dealing with the protection of the environment. Report by Deputy Tamulis.

3. The Law on State Control has been postponed by common agreement. A date has not been agreed upon.

4. Draft law on the status of a deputy of local government of the republic of Lithuania.

5. The decision of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania on the application of Article 18, paragraph two, of the Basic Law on Local Government.

6. A statement by the Republican Election Commission concerning the postponement of elections.

At 0743 GMT a guest from Estonia, Enrik Toome, makes a statement stressing that the Baltic states should now act together. He wishes success for Lithuania, assuring it that Estonia is in solidarity with it.

At 0749 GMT the deputy chairman of the Latvian Supreme Council Foreign Affairs Commission, Mindaugs Berzins, stresses that parliaments in the Baltic states should act together, especially dealing with such problems as the service in the Soviet Army, the status of Soviet citizens, and others.

At 0752 GMT Deputy Tamulis makes a statement on amendments to the government law. He deals with amendments to individual sections in the articles of the law. They concern for the most part environmental protection.

At 0800 GMT questions were asked of the speaker. Debates on the issue take place. Various functions and actions by the government are debated.

At 0843 GMT an interval until 0915 GMT is announced.

Agrarian Reform Debated

LD2905111590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0915 GMT on 29 May resumes broadcasting a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

The first item on the agenda is agrarian reform. Deputy Grakauskas makes a report on this issue on behalf of the Agrarian Commission. He says that the deputies have had copies of the principles of agrarian reform distributed. After describing the present organization in agriculture, he states that nobody is interested in working conscientiously under the conditions of a socialist economy. From 1945-67 large areas of land were neglected, and remained uncultivated. Land reform is a component part of the republic's economic reform, and they should both be carried out together. He proposes that the principles of agrarian reform that he has submitted be very extensively debated.

At 0950 GMT Deputy Grakauskas answers several questions concerning the issue: at present there are 5,000 applications from farmers wishing to manage their farms independently. He expects this number to increase.

At 0957 GMT the deputy in the chair asks the deputies to make their questions and statements shorter, because altogether 26 deputies are on the list of those wishing to take part in the debate.

At 0959 GMT the minister of agriculture, Knasys, comes to the rostrum. He stresses that the proposed theses of agricultural reform represent cardinal problems. Agriculture was the first to introduce privatization into the republic. Already some 2,000 farmers are managing their farms independently. Privatization is being hampered by some conservative farm leaders. It is virtually impossible to return the same land to its previous owners.

At 1017 GMT, answering questions from the deputies, the minister states that a draft law on agricultural reform has been drawn up, but not yet submitted to the council, because more detailed discussions on the principles of reform are essential. Several questions concern applicants for the land, whose requests have not yet been complied with.

At 1028 GMT the next speaker, agricultural expert Kepezinskaite, deals with the principles of denationalization. According to her, denationalization would not mean reprivatization, as it is impossible to return the same property to its previous owners.

At 1039 GMT Kepezinskaite answers deputies questions.

At 1051 GMT Deputy Abisalas proposes that the time for a statement by each speaker should be limited to five minutes.

At 1054 GMT an interval until 1200 GMT is announced.

Debates Continue

LD2905141290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1200 GMT on 29 May resumes broadcasting a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. An announcement is made that Yeltsin has been elected chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. A message from Landsbergis congratulating Yeltsin is read.

At 1203 GMT Deputy Poskus expresses himself in favor of private ownership in agriculture, but various forms of husbandry are essential in the transitional period.

At 1210 GMT Deputy (name indistinct) criticizes some aspects of the theses on agrarian reform concerning future purchase of land.

At 1219 GMT Deputy Milcius emphasizes that agrarian reform is essential. Agricultural studies should be encouraged.

At 1225 GMT Deputy Survila and Deputy Kumza support denationalization of land.

At 1239 GMT Deputy Rimkus deals with improvements in the production of milk, and proposes that agrarian reform should be gradually introduced by testing it in individual rayons. The opinion of rural residents should be taken into account.

At 1251 GMT Deputy Rastauskiene complains that religion was suppressed in the countryside during the Soviet regime, and now churches should be restored there, as this is very important to agricultural people.

At 1300 GMT Deputy (name indistinct) describes difficulties in introducing privatization in agriculture: existing tractors are not suitable for working on small farms, and so on. A program of aid to farmers must be discussed. The agrarian reform should also embrace the processing industry.

At 1308 GMT Deputy Aksomaitis states that propaganda on the advantages of agricultural collectivization is taking place in the countryside. This is due to the lack of proper information among agricultural workers. Mass information media should be more effective in the countryside.

At 1316 GMT Deputy Kvietkauskas thinks that agrarian reform will depend greatly on changes in other spheres of the economy as well. The reform itself should be discussed publicly, not only in parliament but also by agricultural workers.

At 1320 GMT Deputy Kudaba says he is of the opinion that all steps concerning agriculture should be discussed publicly with agricultural workers. He also complains about the overstaffing at various agricultural institutions.

At 1330 GMT an interval until 1400 GMT is announced.

Deputy Status Law Adopted

LD2905175490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 29 May resumes carrying a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

An unidentifiable speaker takes the rostrum and complains about a great difference between prices for agricultural products paid to agricultural workers and those on the market.

At 1404 GMT Deputy Gerdaityte describes the desire of rural residents voluntarily to decide on the form of husbandry. Reform should take place gradually, but existing collective farms should be destroyed immediately, Gerdaityte says.

At 1409 GMT an unidentifiable representative of the farmers' union states that a master must be found for the wealth of the land who would be willing to discharge his duties conscientiously and responsibly. At present there

are very few people in the countryside who can work independently, the farmers' union representative says.

At 1421 GMT an unidentified deputy makes some proposals for improving the work of the Ministry of Agriculture.

At 1428 GMT Deputy Apsega supports the cooperative form of privatization which could be followed later by distributing land to individual farmers.

A proposal is made to discontinue debates and continue them tomorrow. This proposal is adopted.

At 1435 GMT a report is made on the status of local government deputies.

At 1542 GMT voting on individual articles in the law takes place.

At 1550 GMT a vote is taken on the whole law on the status of the local government deputy. It is passed by a majority of votes.

At 1551 GMT the relay appears to end; the next plenary sitting of the Supreme Council will reconvene (?30 May at 1200GMT).

Landsbergis Sends Congratulations to Yeltsin

LD2905131790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1200 GMT 29 May 90

["Text" of a telegram from Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman V. Landsbergis to Boris Yeltsin—read by the chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council at its 29 May proceedings in Vilnius; from the live relay, in Russian]

[Text] Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich. I express my sincere congratulations on the occasion of your election to such an important state post. Many new possibilities and hopes will be linked with you, with your name and your work. Our hopes are also there. We hope that with the rebirth of democratic Russia possibilities unknown until now will be open for genuine and friendly cooperation.

I wish you best of health and endurance.

On behalf of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania,

[Signed] Chairman V. Landsbergis

Disputes at Lithuanian Supreme Council Reported

LD2905212890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1800 GMT 29 May 90

[Text] The dispute flared up from the very first moment at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session, which resumed its work today, when a statement written on behalf of a minority group of deputies containing the proposal to include in the agenda an issue about the behavior of some deputies, who in their speeches in the press, on radio and on television insult their colleagues,

was read out. After the exchange of opinions the majority of the deputies did not agree with this proposal, having transferred it for the examination to the commission on ethics.

Emotions also flared up when an issue about the main principles of implementing agricultural reform in the republic was discussed. It is not surprising. The draft document, which the deputies received, envisages the land and property of the agricultural enterprises which are working now becoming private. The authors of the draft reckon that the land which formerly belonged to claimants or which had been inherited by them ought to be returned for free, and the appropriate redemption fees should be paid for the other land. The examination of the issues concerning agricultural reform will be continued.

The Lithuanian Supreme Council passed the law on the status of the deputies of the local self-governing bodies and discussed some other questions.

Vilnius Radio Protests Against Interference

*LD2905221990 Vilnius International Service
in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 29 May 90*

[Text] Today, Vilnius Radio staff sent a collective telegram, addressed to the USSR State Committee for Radio and Television, seeking an explanation of obvious interference through the Soviet relay system during Vilnius Radio broadcasts to North America.

At Vilnius Radio we are in possession of many indisputable indications that verify that transmitter power is being considerably reduced, or other types of technical obstacles are being set in motion during our broadcasts.

"We understand," says the telegram "that Vilnius Radio broadcasts over Soviet transmitters must be renewed in light of the new conditions, and we are awaiting that moment. Currently, however, we cannot regard your interference in any other light than that of a renunciation of the Soviet policy of glasnost." This was stated in a telegram sent by Vilnius Radio to the leadership of Moscow Television and Radio.

Lithuania's 'Critical' Power Situation Noted

*LD2905192290 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 29 May 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The situation in the Lithuanian economy has reached the critical mark. This is what our correspondent Adolfas Paulius reports:

[Paulius] Frontpaged in today's papers is the communique of the Lithuanian government on the economic situation in the republic. On the 40th day of the economic blockade of Lithuania, we read in the communique, the power resources of the economy have essentially dried up. The situation has become critical. All power stations operating on fuel oil have stopped work.

At Ignalina nuclear power station, which was out of use for some time because of obstacles, only one generator of set no. two is working. [passage omitted] [video shows street scenes, factories]

Lithuanian Commission Studies Fuel Shortages

*LD3005105290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0900 GMT 30 May 90*

[Text] A session of the government commission regulating the republic's economic situation took place this morning at the Council of Ministers. This is correspondent Valdas Kanapienis reporting by phone:

[Kanapienis] Today's sitting of the Antiblockade Commission was chaired by Algirdas Brazauskas, commission chairman. First of all, Lithuania's power engineering situation was discussed. It was stated that [words indistinct] crude oil resources at the Lithuanian hydroelectric plant are running out and the Ignalina nuclear plant is operating on minimal capacity. USSR nuclear power engineering chiefs prohibited stepping up the power output at the Ignalina nuclear plant. In brief, everything is being done so that the power supplies are exhausted in Lithuania as soon as possible. The issue of how to restrict industrial enterprises' power consumption during peak hours was also discussed at the session. The Antiblockade Commission decided that industrial enterprises should prepare for an emergency power cut-off. Some enterprises have small local power generators originally designed for use in case of war. Therefore, these power generators should now be made ready for operation.

It has been decided to make a list of enterprises which will not be supplied with power during peak hours.

After the Lithuanian Ministry of Power Engineering informed neighboring republics that transportation facilities from those republics will not be supplied with fuel in Lithuania, a reply telegram was received from Belorussia stating that vehicles from our republic would not be allowed to fill up with gasoline in Belorussia either. At the moment these issues are being clarified with the Belorussian leadership.

It was also pointed out at the session that tracked vehicles, which are not very common in Vilnius, cause great damage to the asphalt in Vilnius' streets. It is clear that this refers to military equipment. The damage done is being calculated by the city's local government and it is most likely that compensation for the damage will be sought through the courts.

Vilnius Radio Outlines Unemployment Situation

*LD2905085790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1600 GMT 28 May 90*

[Summary] According to information supplied by the employment agency, 1,974 workers applied to the agency last week looking for jobs. Jobs were found for 462 of them, including 324 office workers.

Enterprises and organizations announce that there are 12,000 vacancies, including 4,200 in industrial enterprises, 2,800 in agriculture, and 1,200 on construction sites.

There are only 532 vacancies for office workers.

The best opportunity to find a job is in agriculture. More than 1,700 workers can be employed by the republican agricultural enterprises. Accommodation is provided for most agricultural enterprises.

Landsbergis Issues Appeals to Lithuanians

LD2905123990

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0850 GMT on 29 May broadcasts a 17-minute live or recorded appeal by President Vytautas Landsbergis to the people of Lithuania.

Landsbergis says that many people are asking what is going to happen and how they are going to live. He talks about the meeting of four Lithuanian delegates with M. Gorbachev in the Kremlin, which he describes as follows:

"This was a meeting of four-plus-one but it was the one who did most of the talking. He spoke, so to speak, in a rather friendly manner. Some promises were made: to continue the blockade, not to demand the ultimate revocation of independence but only to suspend it, and this was supposed to mean a great concession.

"However, a day or more passed and we already heard a different story in another conversation with journalists. We heard a different story or to be precise, the same story as before: everything should be revoked, that we were adventurists, that we were dishonest and had adopted illegal acts, as if the nation did not have the sacred right to strive for freedom, to fight for its freedom, and to defend its rights that were violated 50 years ago. So this is how our political contacts with the Kremlin are fluctuating between some hopes that the negotiations, that more acceptable talks, will begin, and then yet again the sky gets clouded over.

"Well, this is understandable because the leaders of the Kremlin have hopes. Their hopes are that Lithuania, the public of Lithuania, will not withstand the pressure, the intimidation, and difficulties, that deterioration will begin weakening the society and perhaps in the end, it will surrender. I have said on many occasions that endurance is our weapon and that we have this weapon. However, if this weapon is taken away from us, if we fail short of tenacity, then the position of Lithuania can become unpredictable indeed."

Following this, Landsbergis speaks about tangible results of this endurance and unity. He explains that this is why the blockade is continuing, resulting in the closure of enterprises and unemployment. Landsbergis says:

"Unemployment brings about a danger that people will start getting anxious and that they will start squabbling with one another. Unemployment raises the fear that perhaps there are many dissatisfied people who will start rising in rebellion, that disturbances will take place in Lithuania and this will provide a convenient opportunity to introduce the so-called presidential rule from another country, from the Kremlin; once again, to submit Lithuania by force to military rule. Those are the threats and they were repeated at the meeting with our four delegates.

"Similar threats are also heard here in Lithuania. Sometimes they are presented in the form of an ultimatum. This is done by the workers of some enterprise or by a meeting of the servicemen.

"Of course, those who want to shake loose, to destabilize social order in Lithuania place most of their hopes on the people of other nationalities rather than Lithuanian."

Landsbergis says that with this view in mind, decisions had been adopted by local governments in some areas of Lithuania. He says that the officials who adopted such decisions were aware that the Supreme Council of this republic would make them null and void and yet they did so because they had their certain aims. Landsbergis states:

"And the aim was to set people against one another, to set people against one another in their rayon and if possible set them against Lithuania, the Lithuanian government, and in this way to help create more and more new tensions and more social discord in Lithuania. Who needs this? We know perfectly well. Perhaps they also aim at helping people with different dispositions with different orientations; they say, let us hold on to the Soviet Union, life is better over there. Well, where living is better, people have had a chance to gain this experience."

Landsbergis goes on to speak in detail about the specific threats that living standards would be lower in Lithuania and that gasoline supplies could not be maintained without the Soviet Union's help. The president also relates the issue of Lithuania's independence to the upcoming summit meeting in Washington, stating:

"We are also thinking about the summit meeting and what issues would be discussed there. There will be issues of disarmament. I do not have anything against this. Let us have fewer weapons, after all, let the weapons of mass destruction be withdrawn from the territory of Lithuania."

Landsbergis goes on to speak in favor of possible trade agreements between states including the Soviet Union because these would open the Soviet Union to the world, and would influence Lithuania's political position in Europe, too. Landsbergis says:

"There is no doubt that Lithuanian issues will also be discussed there. Even the central television announced

the situation in the Soviet Baltic republics. This is how they labeled it. Meanwhile the United States declared long ago that this issue was not a matter of internal affairs, that it was not a part of the USSR: Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are occupied countries and their future should be decided in accordance with the wishes of the people of these countries, according to the wishes of these nations.

"It is not very likely that the path to the honest solution of the future of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will be found in Washington. Nevertheless, it must proceed in this direction and it will proceed. If not this time, then it will be next time. If the same people remain in power, the issue of our independence will not, after all, be discussed behind our backs. Here our decisions have also had some significance."

Landsbergis continues his appeal speaking about accusations the Lithuanian government received for adopting the declaration of independence. Yet at the same time all these difficulties that the blockade imposed on Lithuania forced the government of Lithuania to start the restructuring of the economy of the republic more vigorously than it would have done otherwise.

Speaking of the legal side of the issue of independence of Lithuania, Landsbergis mentions the fact that Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939 was renounced by the Second Congress of the USSR People's Deputies. The USSR Government should logically proceed from this, but this is not the case, he concludes.

Prunskiene Holds 28 May Press Conference

LD2805220990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 28 May 90

[Excerpt] A press conference for republican and foreign journalists was held at the Council of Ministers of the republic of Lithuania today. Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene and Deputy Prime Minister Algirdas Brazauskas met the journalists.

Kazimiera Prunskiene informed the journalists about her participation in the work of the Congress of Catholics which was organized by West Germany and held in West Berlin. As well as representatives of the clergy, representatives of the catholic countries were also invited to the congress. K. Prunskiene represented the republic of Lithuania. She took part in a seminar where she read a report entitled "Lithuania's Future Among European States." The huge hall, with a seating capacity of 5,000, was full. K. Prunskiene had to answer many questions on the subject of Lithuania. Participants showed great interest in matters concerning Lithuania and understanding of our problems. Several times the report was interrupted by applause. As Prime Minister K. Prunskiene said, the applause was for Lithuania, for the people of Lithuania.

K. Prunskiene noted that her meeting with FRG Chancellor Kohl was of great importance. The meeting was a

continuation of the previous meeting which was devoted to the problems of the republic of Lithuania. Chancellor Kohl involved himself in a specific discussion of Lithuanian issues and attentively followed events connected with the republic of Lithuania. The point at issue was how the West regarded the situation in Lithuania, our further actions, how the issue of Lithuania will appear on the eve of the summit meeting in Washington.

The prime minister singled out the brief important meetings with FRG President Richard von Weizsaecker. She met with and talked to the leaders of the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland as well as representatives of the clergy.

Lithuania's wish to return to European civilization, to the community of European culture was profoundly expressed at the congress. Exceptional attention to Lithuania was indicated by the fact that the participants in the congress recognized Lithuania's right to be in this composition and in order to implement this right they recognized a certain priority to us, Kazimiera Prunskiene said.

Deputy Prime Minister Algirdas Brazauskas spoke about the economic situation here in Lithuania. K. Prunskiene and Algirdas Brazauskas answered many questions from journalists. [passage omitted]

Lithuanians Polled on Independence, Compromise

LD2805204990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] An urgent public opinion poll was carried out among residents of Vilnius by the Lithuanian branch of the All-Union Public Opinion Poll Center. Almost 1,000 residents of Vilnius were polled during a period of one day.

The answer to the question: Do you think that the Lithuanian Supreme Council should revoke the decision about the restoration of the statehood of Lithuania was: 72 percent said no; 19 percent said yes. It should be pointed out that in April, 21 percent gave an affirmative answer to the same question.

The opinion in nationality groups was the following: Lithuanians are very consolidated—95 percent are against revoking the 11 March act; 44 percent of Russians and 47 percent of Belorussians are of the same opinion; the number of those in doubt among Poles has increased and comprises 17 percent although more than half of those polled do not want the Lithuanian parliament to revoke its decision.

Fourteen percent of those polled do not want any compromises in the negotiations with the USSR Government; 73 percent stand for compromise.

Answering the question of which political parties they support, 41 percent support Sajudis. In April this figure was 46 percent. Fifteen percent support the independent

Lithuanian Communist Party. This figure was 10 percent in April. The Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform is supported by nine percent of those polled.

Fifty-nine percent of those polled are of the opinion that essential help from the West should not be expected in the coming months.

Vilnius Rayon Soviet Urges Referendum

*LD2705113490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1200 GMT 26 May 90*

[Text] The question of the secession of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic from the composition of the Soviet Union may be solved only by means of a referendum, the participants in a session of the Vilniusskiy Rayon Soviet announced. Vilniusskiy Rayon is one of Lithuania's agricultural rayons that are adjacent to the capital of the republic, and are traditionally called Vilnius Kray. The deputies stressed that separate referendums must be conducted in those rayons of the republic which were incorporated into Lithuania on the basis of political decisions adopted by the leadership of the Soviet Union before the war in 1939-40.

Leningrad City Soviet Ignores Lithuanian Blockade

*LD2605091290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian
1200 GMT 25 May 90*

[Text] The Leningrad City Soviet is striving to ignore Lithuania's economic blockade. One of the deputies, who asked that his name not be mentioned, stated that the Leningrad City Soviet will endeavor to help Lithuania's motor transport to obtain fuel even if the personnel at fueling stations would hinder this.

Food products supplied by Lithuania to Leningrad have not disappeared from the shelves of the shops.

Urges Halt to Blockade

*LD2905221890 Vilnius International Service
in English 2130 GMT 29 May 90*

[Text] The municipal council of Russia's second largest city, Leningrad, has passed a resolution urging the Soviet president to immediately stop the escalation of Lithuania's blockade and to start talks.

The council also calls upon the work collectives and inhabitants of the city to back the resolution and to oppose any unlawful acts by the all-Union ministries.

The blockade of Lithuania does a great harm to the economy of Leningrad and increases tension in various regions of the Soviet Union, says the resolution of the Leningrad Municipal Council.

Moscow TV Views Differing Estonian Meetings

*LD2805182190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 28 May 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] What is happening in Estonia at present?

[Correspondent Lenk] Two political forums took place yesterday and today in Estonia. The first of these was held in the mining town of Kokhtla-Jarve where deputies of all levels, who see Estonia's future only within the Soviet Federation, gathered together.

In the hall of the party city committee, 160 deputies assembled. Incidentally, in Estonia there are roughly 4,000 people's deputies of all levels. At this congress, a parallel structure of political and economic authority was set up, which has been called the Estonian Council of National Economy [Estonkiy Sovnarkhoz].

The duties of the Council of National Economy also include, in the words of the deputies, monitoring the activity of the Supreme Soviet and the government of Estonia. [video shows television footage of this meeting]

Opposite aims were set by participants of the Second Congress of the People's Front of Estonia. Here, new ways were elaborated for the People's Front to help the Supreme Soviet and the government of the republic achieve Estonia's sovereignty and also resolve a number of topical political and economic problems.

After all, as was noted at the congress, it is precisely the People's Front which has been the initiator of the major changes in the republic in recent years.

Representatives of the people's movements of Lithuania, Latvia, Belorussia, and the Ukraine were invited to the congress. [video shows footage of this congress]

More on Congresses

*PM2905151990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 May 90 Morning Edition p 3*

[Report by correspondent Leonid Levitskiy: "Beginning of Separation?"]

[Text] Tallinn—On Friday there was the Congress of Estonian Citizens. On Saturday, the Congress of People's Deputies of all levels and delegates of labor collectives defending the USSR federative system. The Second Congress of the People's Front started on Saturday and ended on Sunday.

This concentration of political events is no accident. Each of the public organizations representing particular strata is in a hurry to establish its place and role in Estonia's radically changing life. There is also increasing rivalry among the advocates of state independence about how to achieve it and who the leader is going to be. It was all this that determined the course of the three political forums.

I will dwell in greater detail on the congress—it has already caused an emotional outburst. What brought about the congress? I found the answer in the documents adopted at it. They say that the Estonian Supreme Soviet has announced the start of the restoration of the Estonian republic and brought into effect a number of articles of the 1938 Constitution. Organs are therefore needed which would protect the interests of USSR citizens in Estonia. At any rate, until the USSR president's decrees are carried out and the situation is normalized.

On the eve of the congress Supreme Soviet deputy speaker M. Lauristin made a radio appeal for the disruption of the deputies' meeting. This made the situation extremely tense and forced the congress organizers to focus efforts on the protection of public order in Kohtla-Järve, where the deputies' meeting was taking place, and to ensure their safety. Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Ryutov appeared on television and helped to ease the situation by asking people not to try to disrupt the congress.

The congress passed off peacefully, without any outrageous events. None of the deputies even suggested declaring autonomy or setting up any alternative organs of power or government in the republic. But the path to Estonian independence—and this is the firm opinion of deputies from Kohtla-Järve, Narva, Sillamae, Paldiski, and Tallinn and workers' delegates in Pärnu and Tartu—is via a referendum. With the entire population of the republic participating.

The congress participants elected an interregional council and its chairman. He is Supreme Soviet Deputy V. Lebedev. The congress approved the statute on the National Economy Council and appointed its chairman—USSR People's Deputy V. Yarovoy.

On Friday evening the Congress of Estonian Citizens declared itself the supreme legislative organ, deciding thereby to take over the Supreme Soviet's paramount function—law-making. As we can see, there were fears of manifestations of alternative power in Kohtla-Järve, but it came into being in Tallinn.

Reactions to the Congress of Deputies in Kohtla-Järve and to the determined bid for power by the Estonian Citizens' Congress varied in the republic. The final assessment was expected from the Second Congress of the People's Front. It is the leading political force today. The congress delegates described the congress in Kohtla-Järve as a political provocation and attempt to create a republic within a republic. They demanded that the Supreme Soviet protect the indigenous inhabitants of East Virumaa. Probably neither the authors of the resolution nor those who had approved it had managed to see the joint statements by the mayors of all the cities in East Virumaa on civil peace in Kohtla-Järve.

There was a lengthy argument over the assessment of the decision by the citizens' congress. Everyone agreed that it was both mistaken and harmful, disuniting the supporters of an Estonian republic. In the end the delegates

recognized the Estonian Supreme Soviet as the supreme legislative authority, without commenting in any way on the intentions of the citizens' congress. A diplomatic decision like this is understandable: The People's Front has to strengthen cooperation between the Supreme Soviet and the citizens' congress. But, formally, Estonia is on the brink of a dyarchy.

Head of New Estonian Home Defense Appointed

LD2505114190 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 0700 GMT 16 May 90

[Summary] Olev Laanjarv, minister of internal affairs, was appointed head of the newly established Home Defense [kodukaitse], with Andrus Oovel appointed head of the Home Defense Headquarters, by resolution of the Estonian Government.

Laanjarv Interviewed

LD2505114290

[Editorial Report] Tallinn Estonian Television Network in Russian at 1600 GMT on 21 May carries a five-minute interview with Olev Laanjarv, Estonian minister of internal affairs, by unidentified correspondent on the subject of the newly established Home Defense [kodukaitse]. Laanjarv, who is also head of the Home Defense, explains who can volunteer to become a member: anybody who is at least 18 years old and will swear allegiance to Estonia, regardless of nationality, belief or party membership. Laanjarv says that the rumors that the Home Defense will be associated with the Defense League [Kaitseliit] at a future date are untrue as Home Defense volunteers will never carry arms. When the reporter asks if any Russian speakers have enrolled, Laanjarv says that the interest is there: "I am sure that after an explanation of this kind, after explaining the position of this organization, many people of other nationalities will also join it, to protect their rights," he concludes.

Estonia's Lauristin Views Baltic 'Myths'

PM2605114190 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 20, 20 May 90 p 4

[Interview with Estonian People's Front leader Marju Lauristin by Edgar Cheporov in Washington, date not specified: "The Baltic Problem Is an International Problem"]

[Text] The exchange of messages between Helmut Kohl, Francois Mitterrand and Vytautas Landsbergis, and the visit to the U.S. and West Europe by Kazimiera Prunskiene and Marju Lauristin have taken the troubled relations of the Baltic Republics with the USSR to a new, international level, which calls in turn for a new level of understanding, the ability to listen to what the other side is saying. The head of Estonia's Popular Front and chair of Estonia's Social Democratic Party of Independence, Marju Lauristin, recently spoke to MN's Edgar Cheporov in Washington.

Question: What is the nature of your mission in the US?

Answer: It could be called educational. I'm giving lectures to mainly business people, explaining the situation in the Baltics so as to dispel some of the myths circulating here—and in the USSR for that matter. I have talked about the economic relations that independent Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania could have with regions in the Soviet Union and with the West and I want to know what they think about us here.

Question: Which myths do you have in mind?

Answer: The myth that says the Baltics are ignoring the interests of others, that they're "rocking Gorbachev's boat". I've had to argue about this a lot here and to describe in which ways the reform in the Soviet Union relates to what is happening in the Baltics, and now the situation in the Baltics, can now be used to benefit the Soviet Union, i.e., the new economic possibilities given new contacts and agreements in the social and political spheres. I would like to see people's understanding of developments in the Baltics become more rational both here and at home, rather than being based on purely emotional and ideological assessments of events.

Question: What do Americans think about the situation in the Baltics?

Answer: Speaking before a wide range of people, including those of highly-placed officials, I could feel—and this heartened me—a great difference between the official Washington reaction, which I would describe as cautious, and what business people and politicians say, those who are interested in the Baltics' development, who support our historical right to independence. People are prepared to help us try to bring Moscow to the negotiating table.

Question: But from most press accounts and opinion polls, one gathers that as far as Americans are concerned "Lithuania is not worth the candle". That formula frequently appeared in the papers. This attitude, as they admit in America, is dictated by an unwillingness "to hurt Mikhail Gorbachev". Does this attitude still prevail?

Answer: Yes. But this reaction outrages the people I talked to here. The way Mr. Bush received Kazimiera Prunskiene, I think, helped Lithuania in a sense, while the public criticized Bush's behaviour.

To describe the Baltics as a "flash point" is naive because real "flash points" and much greater difficulties exist elsewhere, whereas the Baltics are being exploited both in the USSR and over here so as to avoid the real, far more serious problems.

Question: You've mentioned Kazimiera Prunskiene. Do you remember her high assessment of Gorbachev? This was noted with surprise by THE NEW YORK TIMES which evidently expected her to hit out at Gorbachev. She said that by the start of the upcoming Washington

summit Mikhail Gorbachev "would be more popular than ever". What do you think?

Answer: The ulterior motive of THE NEW YORK TIMES article was this. Bush was caddish with Prunskiene to please Gorbachev while Prunskiene proved to be a cleverer and more discriminating politician. That's one. Two is that Prunskiene essentially said the same things I said. We sit together at the Supreme Soviet sessions and see many things the same way. It is after all important to see what roles Gorbachev plays at different times, his international policy, on the one hand, and his relationship with the inter-regional group and the Baltics, on the other. As for Prunskiene's personal attitude, it is her own feminine view, her more integral view of Gorbachev as both talented and in a tough situation and therefore deserving of feminine sympathy.

Question: What do you think of Helmut Kohl and Francois Mitterrand stepping into the Lithuanian situation?

Answer: I assess their move as very positive. One might of course wish that both could be more definite on what they think of international talks, but still this is a serious sign—as we keep saying—that the Baltics are in fact an international problem of the same order as that of two Germanys. It relates to the game that was played between the USSR and Germany in the late 1930s. And the allies' policy during the Yalta talks. We won't be able to break the vicious circle as long as this problem remains the USSR's internal problem.

Question: In your American appearances you spoke of the problem of a "new Soviet federation". Here in the U.S. I've heard it said that with the creation of a genuinely new federation of Soviet peoples, withdrawing from it would make no sense.

Answer: Before creating a new federation, one should see what the old one really is because the very structure of the Soviet federation is based on centralization rather than on the good and free will of the peoples. Before creating a new federation one should see what the basic principles should be and let the peoples make their own free choice. There's nothing new in this concept and, had they heard Sakharov at the first Congress, had they recognized that only the right to a free choice can save the Soviet Union, we would not be facing this crisis today.

Question: What kind of consensus with Moscow do you intend to seek? What steps do you think both sides should take to end the crisis?

Answer: First, recognition of the historical truth should underlie all talks on the Baltics. The fact that the Soviet Union used armed force to occupy the Baltics in 1940, in violation of its treaties with the Baltic Republics signed in 1939. The right of the Baltic peoples to independence must be recognized before talks can get under way. We

are ready for any talks, for the discussion of all issues of mutual interest, but our historical right must be recognized.

Second, I think, there are many people in Moscow who could form a think tank to consider what use the independent Baltics could be to the Soviet Union. The Baltics can serve as a province ground for various alternative social, economic and financial solutions. The Baltics should be given help in establishing their own currency convertible both into Soviet roubles and Western currencies and thus a bridge for the rouble's convertibility. I think such prospects should stir the minds of those in Moscow who see that the Baltics can help perestroika in the Soviet Union.

Gorbunov Views Meeting with Gorbachev

*LD2905122190 Riga International Service in Latvian
1730 GMT 24 May 90*

[Text] The chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian republic, Anatoliy Gorbunov, yesterday informed deputies about his meeting in the Kremlin with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev. In a brief 20-minute conversation, the restoration of state sovereignty of the Estonian and Latvian republics, was mentioned. Mikhail Gorbachev emphatically repeated that as long as the Supreme Soviets of the Latvian and Estonian republics do not rescind their declarations of independence, there will be no discussions with Moscow. There has been no opportunity of specifying, Anatoliy Gorbunov emphasized, whether the promised talks will be about the way for restoring state sovereignty, or about the ways of determining the further status of the republics in general.

Latvians Cautioned Against Signing Petitions

*LD2905153190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
0429 GMT 29 May 90*

[Text] Respected listeners: Pay special attention when signing petitions. This message to inhabitants was expressed by several radio listeners who called our editorial office yesterday. In several places in Riga, and in rayons such as Madona, signatures are being collected under a text beginning: For a Latvia outside the USSR. As has been observed, several people, without reading the ensuing text, have easily signed the paper. Usually, the collector of signatures is not especially communicative because it is better to conceal this or that, or, more correctly, not to state it emphatically. In the middle of the text, quite unobtrusively, apparently innocently, it adds that Latvia outside the USSR can and should be achieved with the aid of a referendum. Just yesterday, participants in the Equal Rights Faction were speaking about the need for a referendum. This was stressed by adherents of the CPSU platform. But holding such a referendum is contrary to the 4 May independence declaration.

So before you put your signatures on petitions, definitely read them to the end. Otherwise it may turn out that you will be supporting opinions by groups who are unfavorable to our nation.

Pro-Moscow Latvian Party Bureau Meets

*LD2505040890 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
1730 GMT 23 Mar 90*

[Text] The session of the Central Committee Bureau of the Latvian Territorial Organization of the CPSU discussed the question of the activity of the CPSU members who are working in administrative organs of the state.

A resolution was adopted in which bureau members protested the depoliticization of the state organs, and, took a stand against the cessation of party organisations' activities at work-places. The Latvian Central Committee bureau of the CPSU emphasized that rayon committees show special concern for those CPSU members who intend to break their relations with the Communist Party.

It was decided to prepare an appeal to the procurator of the republic, expressing a demand to defend constitutional norms, and citizens' rights and freedoms. In the event of this not being observed, the bureau will reserve the right to turn to the USSR procurator-general to help to restore social justice. Likewise it was resolved to address a demand to the Supreme Soviet of the republic to bring to an end government discrimination against particular citizens' groups; it was not stated which. The results of the meeting of the secretaries of the Central Committees of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Communist parties on the CPSU platform were deemed positive. An understanding was reached to work out a draft for a new Union treaty, with the Baltic republics remaining within the structure of the USSR.

Pro-Soviet Committee Formed in Latvia

*LD2605175890 Moscow World Service in English
0710 GMT 26 May 90*

[Passages in quotation marks recorded in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] A committee has been set up in Latvia to protect the Soviet people and their Constitution. Our correspondent has more on the issue:

[Reporter] The committee was formed by the Latvian Communist Party loyal to the Soviet Communist Party, the International Front, with most of its membership being Russian, and some other organizations. All of them reject the declaration the Latvian Supreme Soviet adopted on 4 May to restore the independence of the Latvian Republic.

Latvian Communist Party Secretary Alfred Rubiks was elected committee chairman. Asked over the phone how his committee could help the dialogue between two

governments, one in the Latvian capital Riga, the other in Moscow, Alfred had this to say:

[Rubiks] "That's no task for our committee. This must uphold the guarantees the two constitutions, the Soviet and Latvian, give the Soviet citizen. A service is being formed to help the people whose human and civil rights have been damaged, and we want a referendum on Latvia's national (?set up). In this sense the committee must help initiate the dialogue."

The committee has come into being in a tense situation. It is tense indeed, despite the relative peace and quiet in the republic. Society is growing less united. The committee was formed in response to the independence declaration on the one hand, and on the other the establishment of a Committee of the Citizens of the Latvian Republic. This committee came into being early this month and it presses for Latvia's full sovereignty. These two committees virtually represent the two key positions of the people of Latvia. The situation in the republic depends in large measure on their cooperation. Is dialogue possible? A member of the Latvian Supreme Soviet and also of the Committee of Citizens of the Latvian Republic and national independence movement Yuris Dobelis said;

[Dobelis] "The two committees hold extreme positions. The Committee of the Citizens of Latvia stands for returning to the situation that existed before 1940; that's too much. Some things require a new approach and we members of the Supreme Soviet appreciate this. But the Committee for the Protection of Soviet Citizens doesn't. It turned down the idea of Latvian independence."

Alfred Rubiks, chairman of the Committee for the Protection of the Soviet Constitution, holds a slightly different view:

[Rubiks] "The Committee of the Citizens of Latvia and our own committees are poles apart as far as their tasks go. One represents the citizens who would like secession from the Soviet Union, the other remaining within the Soviet Union. That's why there can be only a human rights dialogue. The one and the other are pressing for their rights but none must damage human rights."

Latvian Chairman Views Need for 'Self-Control'

PM2605115390 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 20, 20 May 90 p 4

[Interview with Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Gorbunov by Janis Udris, correspondent in Latvia: "Wish Us Self-Control"; date not specified]

[Text] [Udris] Mr. Chairman, you began each parliamentary session with a republican KGB and MVD report that the previous day in Latvia had passed quietly. What is your opinion about the mood of the people after May 4?

[Gorbunov] Some immediately expressed their enthusiasm. Others received the news with well-known concern which hasn't diminished, but is even growing to some extent. In Latvia there are no outrages, no mass violations of the law. But the feeling of concern is increasing all the same. In fact, we have proclaimed the principle of restoring state independence and sovereignty, but the transition period arouses the people's anxiety. For the time being, nothing much is being said publicly. This is the main issue which we have to work on—dialogue must be conducted in the Republic as well as in Moscow.

[Udris] Some people ask: wasn't there an alternative to the May 4 Declaration; say, a version that suited everyone?

[Gorbunov] A version satisfying all people simply does not exist. Until now we have been looking for it and I personally gave much effort to the search for such a version. Of course, this declaration may be treated critically, it can be condemned by organizations as well as individuals. But the United Council of Work Collectives, which called for a political strike on May 15, suggests nothing and does not advance any constructive alternative. They speak about a "renewed federation", not explaining what that is, and how it would solve our vital problems. In fact, the mass of problems we face led the Republic to a situation where it had to be decided how to live further. So, the May 4 Declaration was adopted. The United Council of Work Collectives advances the slogan: "Let's defend the Soviet power!" From whom? From the Soviets? From the first democratically elected government in the Republic?

[Udris] Representatives of the opposition sometimes reproach you at the sessions of parliament and in the press with inconsistency. They recall that at one time you agreed with the idea of Latvia within a renewed federation. Now you stand for the restoration of state independence for Latvia.

[Gorbunov] As people's deputies of the USSR, we advanced a number of proposals at the congress on the restoration of the republic's sovereignty. We suggested that at least the first step be taken towards this. But in six months it became clear that we cannot achieve anything, either at the Congress or the Supreme Soviet. Because the mechanism of equality for Republics does not exist and, therefore, the discussion of any issue requiring such a mechanism of supreme power becomes senseless.

But I have never spoken for Latvia to immediately secede from the USSR. I advocated that the Soviet Union should turn from the Union of Republics into a Union of sovereign states and I have never changed this "slogan" of mine.

[Udris] What is your present attitude to the status of people's deputy of the USSR?

[Gorbunov] I think that we all must preserve it. Not for changing USSR laws—we have tried to do that and

failed. But as people's deputies of the USSR we must express our opinion about the decisions adopted in Latvia, about our proposals, and maintain a dialogue.

[Udris] What will be the next steps of the republican parliament?

[Gorbunov] These days the government is being formed. But the main thing is to start the transition period.

[Udris] How are minority rights observed in the work of the parliament?

[Gorbunov] The minority faction in the parliament (Equal Rights unites about 50 deputies) gets much more time for critical remarks than the majority faction (NFL).

[Udris] What are the relations between the parliament and both Communist parties existing in Latvia—CPL (on the platform of the CPSU) and the Independent Communist Party of Latvia?

[Gorbunov] For us they are parliamentary parties. But it is a different question how they regard themselves. In the parliament Communist parties can organize their factions, express their view, advance proposals—there is no problem in this.

[Udris] What is your attitude to the television speech of Alfreds Rubiks, the present leader of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia on the CPSU platform, in which he paraphrased his telephone conversation with Gorbachev, president of the USSR, and quoted his words. Do you have other, official information about Gorbachev's viewpoint on the events taking place?

[Gorbunov] The statement of Alfreds Rubiks is his personal affair. I can't tell you about all my personal conversations with Gorbachev, otherwise the public of Latvia will be compelled to discuss some details and words of these conversations, regarding each of them as an official statement, a document. I think that this is absolutely unacceptable in politics. At the given moment there is nothing in particular which I relate to be the content of an official dialogue. But as is generally known, the President asked for a more detailed explanation about the transition period.

[Udris] My impression is that information about Latvia is not as sensational as about Lithuania.

[Gorbunov] The USSR President and the Soviet leadership apparently follow all the processes taking place here, we provide them with all the information they need. Mass media evidently sense the mood of the USSR leadership and continue to reflect it.

[Udris] What is your attitude to the developments in Lithuania? From our statements at the session it was clear that it is positive. But as a professional politician, do you see anything that frightens you?

[Gorbunov] Latvia is already following a different road: our declaration substantially differs from the Lithuanian. But it is very difficult to express my opinion regarding a completely different situation. We in Latvia cannot follow the Lithuanian road. But obviously we have common aims. We have a common past and common future. In the basic issues of principle we must coordinate our actions.

[Udris] What would you like to hear from me at the end of the interview?

[Gorbunov] For me personally—nothing. But for all of us you may wish self-control.

Farmers Movement Fund Set Up in Latvia

LD2605200390 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0451 GMT 26 May 90

[By LEFA Correspondent Tatyana Kovalskaya]

[Text] Riga, 26 May (TASS)—Within only a year the Farmers' Movement [fermerskoye dvizheniye] in Latvia has gained the characteristics of a mass movement: the republic now has almost 6,000 peasant holdings. The Peasants' Fund [Krestyanskiy Fond] has taken on the defense of their interests. The fund has been initiated by the Latvian People's Front, the Latvian Culture Fund, the Agro-Industrial Bank, the Union of Consumer Societies, the Lawyers' Society and other new organizations that have emerged in the republic recently.

Our organization is born of market relations among the peasantry, I was told by fund chairman, farmer Vitaliy Teyvans, until recently a worker in the party apparatus and the leader of the communists of one of Riga's largest rayons. The fund will provide the peasants with all kinds of services, from facilitating the acquisition of machinery to providing financial aid.

Of the seven programs planned by the fund, six are commercial and only the program for the social orientation of peasant families will not be profitable and viable in a direct sense. It includes setting up a peasants' college, organizing work experience for young people from the towns and countryside on peasant holdings, opening insurance companies, providing care for peasant families with many children, social welfare and medical care.

The financial aid program will not begin operating immediately since savings have first to be formed. Even now, though, the fund is bringing the peasants to what are called private sponsors and people who agree to low interest credit and in time the fund will be able to offer loans itself.

Latvian Trade Unions Congress Opens

LD2505135890 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT
25 May 90

[Text] Riga May 25 TASS—The Latvian republican Council of Trade Unions may no longer exist in a few days, following the decision of the Congress of Latvian Trade Unions, which opened in Riga today, to set up an association of independent trade unions.

Prior to the congress ten out of 25 sectoral unions declared themselves independent. The rest are expected to decide their status after the congress.

For two days 728 delegates will determine the role and place of trade union associations, outline main areas of activity and pass a charter.

Military School Chief on Admissions Program

PM2905112790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 23 May 90 First Edition p 1

["Topical Interview" with Colonel V. Taranin, chief of the Riga Higher Military Aviation Engineering School, by correspondent Colonel A. Manushkin: "The School Will Be Admitting Students"]

[Excerpt] The telephone call to Riga was no accident. The thing is that the editorial office had started receiving letters from readers asking the question: "Will students be admitted this year to military schools on the territory of the Baltic republics?" Many parents fear for the future of sons who have expressed a wish to go to these educational establishments, since apparently there is a complex political situation there. Our correspondent Colonel A. Manushkin called Colonel V. Taranin, chief of the Riga Higher Military Aviation Engineering School named for Yakov Alksnis.

[Manushkin] Vladimir Mikhaylovich, is there any justification for the fears expressed in readers' letters?

[Taranin] To be honest, there is no justification. Student admissions will take place strictly according to plan and in full. Of course, the complex political situation in Latvia has meant that there have been considerably fewer applications to study at our school than in past years. It used to be very competitive, but so far only two-thirds of the places have been applied for. But I will definitely say that parents (those whose sons are studying here and those whose sons want to devote themselves to aircraft) need have no doubts: We will not let their children down. They are at the school under the "guardianship" of experienced commanders and teachers.

[Manushkin] But the students get city passes as well....

[Taranin] Yes, if they want to go they get passes. In fact, as of the third year they do not live in barracks, but in hostels, and they are allowed to wear civilian clothes when off duty. Incidentally, so far there has not been a single incident in the city involving students.

And another thing. There are 15 Latvians at our school. In all we have around 120 students from the Baltic republics. [passage omitted]

Latvian Popular Front Paper Changes Name

LD2905143490 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
1730 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] Today the Russian-language newspaper of the Latvian People's Front is appearing for readers under a new name: BALTIYSKAYA VREMYA. Initially, the Latvian- and Russian-language editions of the newspaper ATMODA [AWAKENING] were to a certain extent identical, but now they have changed into two different newspapers, and of course they could not be registered under one and the same. As the editor of BALTIYSKAYA VREMYA, Aleksey Grigoryev, said, the new name imposes new obligations, and the editorial collective will strive to fulfill them. For example, in the materials more attention will be paid to problems common to the whole Baltic region.

Baltic Declaration Views Gorbachev Authority

LD2905224590 Vilnius International Service
in English 2200 GMT 29 May 90

[Text] The Lithuanian media have announced the declaration signed on Saturday [26 May] by the foreign ministers of the three Baltic states. The declaration refers to the mandate of the Soviet President Gorbachev for the upcoming summit in Washington and says that the three Baltic states will welcome those Soviet-American agreements which are conducive to the restoration of the independence of the Baltic states, that would eliminate the problems remaining unsettled after World War II and would thus help establish lasting peace.

The declaration also (?stresses that the) Soviet president has no legal authorization to represent the Baltic states and that no agreements signed in Washington can have a binding force for the Baltic states.

Stockholm Symposium Views Baltic Independence

PM2905110890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 May 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by special correspondents M. Zubko, L. Kape-lyushnyy: "The Invisible Shore: Reflections on Baltic Independence and European Security"]

[Text] Stockholm—The bronze Charles XII, perhaps the only Swedish king familiar to us all, stretches out his palm from the Stockholm quay in the direction of his unsuccessful campaigns, where once again "the East burns with a new dawn." It burns, painting the skies on our side of the Baltic now in the color of hope, now in the color of concern.... Prosperous, rich, well-fed Sweden, after rejoicing in the smooth beginning of our perestroika, suddenly grew alarmed. The reason—the events in the Soviet Baltic republics.

"Baltic Independence—European Security?"—the question mark in the title of the symposium organized by the Swedish Foreign Policy Institute reads like an invitation to reflections on whether perestroika will break up in a spin as it hits the sharp bend of Baltic independence. Why is the symposium being held in Sweden, in fact, and what is it for? When the greater part of the work was done, we asked Bo Hold, director of the institute, to answer that question.

"The idea is to discuss the problems of the Baltic republics from the viewpoint of European perspectives. There are many difficulties here, but we must realize that everything that has happened in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia is the result of Gorbachev's policy and the democratization process. The time has come to discuss how the Soviet Union intends to transform its structure, what form the new Soviet federalism will take, which of the 15 republics will not accept it, and what ways of resolving the problem are proposed in that case.... It seems to me that a fruitful exchange of opinions is taking place."

You could put it like this: Sweden is looking toward the invisible Soviet shore in order to find out for sure what it can expect from its neighbor.

Since the problems of the Baltic region became a constant topic in news publications, an argument has been in progress: Are these events really so important for the future of the European states? Why, one wonders, should the Swedes, Finns, and Norwegians worry? Does their concern not amount to an attempt to influence our internal affairs?

The symposium was held in one of the halls of the Swedish Riksdag—an honorable venue which certainly gives the event prestige. But for Sweden this is a matter of course, and what counts is the result, not the surroundings. Among the nearly 200 participants in the discussion, there was particular interest in the "men of the moment"—D. Ivans, leader of the Latvian People's Front, who was recently elected first deputy chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet; C. Stankevicius, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet; USSR People's Deputy M. Vulfson from Riga; L. Meri from Tallinn....

On the first day the problems examined appeared to be far removed from the urgent concerns of the Soviet Baltic region—the equilibrium of military-political forces in Europe. As for the dominant theme of the symposium, it is detente, the exclusion of not only the possibility, but the prerequisites of military conflict. The majority of speakers agreed in the view that this requires an equilibrium of forces, and this equilibrium was in the last analysis associated with Gorbachev's policy and with him as an individual.

We did not originally intend to overload these observations with quotations, but the idea expressed by Doctor Christoph Bertram (Hamburg) merits attention: "The changes in Eastern Europe should not weaken the

USSR's security. We should help ensure that the Soviet Union is integrated into European processes." In his opinion this idea should be the aim of transformations of a democratic nature, economic and social development, and national rebirth.

This is very important: Our so-called domestic affairs, our passions over major or minor issues arouse interest in Europe, because stability in the country is a bridge leading to stability in the European home. And so we reach the main point—how does public opinion abroad assess events in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia? Does it condemn them? No. Does it support them? No again.

Of course, the desire for national rebirth and self-determination by nations prompts sympathy and support. For the mature, established democracy of our overseas neighbors, the violation of the rights of an individual, and still more of an entire people, is tantamount to sacrilege. There is sharp rejection of the use of force—whether military force or economic sanctions—whatever the motives or explanations. And we would say that in this respect the views of our own democratic movements coincide with foreign views. But at the same time....

Let us suppose that the symposium had taken place in the capital of one of the Baltic republics. The venue would have been besieged by a crowd carrying flags, banners, and posters, the content of which is familiar to everyone: "Occupiers, go home!", "Independence without delay," "The USSR is the evil empire," "The CPSU is a party without a future," and so forth—without a second thought. The substitution of mob rule for democracy and slogans for thought, the intolerance of dissidence which means that a new inquisition crystallizes out of every new faith—all this would not have done much to promote the calm exchange of opinions. Naturally, the crowd would have showered with compliments the author of these words: "Many people think that the USSR could join the common European home as an empire" (D. Ivans). Or: "Everyone says that Gorbachev's policy is more important than our independence, but I think independence is more important than Gorbachev's policy!" (M. Vulfson), and especially the assertion that independence (as was said by representatives of all the Baltic republics) should be granted immediately and there can be no question of submitting to the law on secession from the USSR or Moscow's other "tricks."

The walls of the Swedish Riksdag have probably heard all kinds of things from all kinds of people, but we think that this was the first time that the sober reasoning of Western experts has been counterposed to the peremptoriness of such opinions from the Soviet side (let us not forget that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are still Soviet).

Doctor Hans Binnendijk (London) sees the way to independence for the Baltic states as being a succession of

mutual concessions, compromise solutions, and long-term treaties on this basis. In his opinion a military alliance should be concluded between the USSR and the Baltic republics.

We would like to stress this detail: Many speakers touched in one way or another on Soviet-American relations and the summit meeting, and came to the conclusion that the situation in the Baltic region is hardly likely to influence them decisively. This view is also important in assessing the European situation in general. The political leaders of Lithuania and now also Latvia and Estonia are trying to persuade the governments and public of European states to exert diplomatic and psychological pressure on the USSR. As you can see, this has not yet succeeded. The West has realized quite clearly that not only is your own home your castle, but that someone else's home enjoys the same status.

Evidently it is a rare European state that can boast that its national problems are fully resolved. And self-determination on a unilateral basis, as it is understood in the Baltic republics, could set a bad example and cause a chain reaction in the shape of conflicts which would destroy peace on the continent. Suffice it to recall Kosovo in Yugoslavia, Transylvania in Romania, the Basque Country in Spain, and so forth. Sweden, perhaps one of the most fortunate countries in this respect, was in no hurry to recognize Lithuania's independence, on the basis of the principle of reason and the norms of international law.

At the end of the symposium there was a free discussion. Representatives of all platforms and positions were invited to take the stage. We asked a question that they evidently found awkward: Will a referendum be held in the Baltic republics as a first and most important step toward self-determination? In the opinion of Latvian People's Front leader D. Ivans, secession from the USSR cannot be decided under the USSR's law, because "colonization has led to a situation where the indigenous population accounts for only one-half of the population of Latvia, and in this situation it is immoral to demand a referendum." But if the numbers of the indigenous population represent the main issue, what are Lithuania's political leaders afraid of? About 80 percent of the republic's population are Lithuanian. The answer is—the army. The military, they say, will vote how they are ordered to vote. And there are a given number of them today, but tomorrow there could be three times that number.

That is not the case, to put it mildly. In Lithuania, according to the law on referendums, only citizens of Lithuania take part in the vote. Servicemen on compulsory military service are not citizens of Lithuania, and are even deprived of the right to participate in elections (unlike the situation in Sweden, where even foreigners take part in municipal elections).

If we were divided only by the sea.... If we were divided by language, income, traditions. If we were people of

different faiths or convictions, independence and security would never have been linked by a question mark.... Independence for one, if you go back to the word's original meaning, is the guarantee of his neighbor's security. He who is truly free—an individual or a nation—cannot be the agent of a lack of freedom or encroach on someone else's land, will, or destiny. Independence only has any value and is true to its name when it is achieved not in spite of, but in the name of—in the name of the happiness of all citizens, all groups, all neighbors. And if today on our shores, which are invisible from Sweden, thousands of people cannot hear one another, what are we creating? And why are we rocking the boat?

RSFSR

Moscow TV Relays 29 May Congress Proceedings

Yeltsin Wins Election

LD2905152190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 29 May begins carrying a recording of the 29 May session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow.

The recording begins by showing deputies taking their seats in the hall. At 1435 GMT a deputy suggests amendments to a statement on Chernobyl.

At 1437 GMT a deputy from Kursk Oblast asks why his oblast has not been included in the statement. Another deputy suggests that Orenburg Oblast should be included in the statement too, because a year ago there was a nuclear test there and the consequences are still being felt. A vote is taken on the statement and it is adopted.

At 1441 GMT the chairman of the tellers commission says the commission is ready for voting on Vlasov, Yeltsin, and Tsoy. Everybody leaves the hall to vote and a break until 1300 Moscow time is announced.

The recording continues and shows the start of the afternoon session at 1443 GMT.

At 1444 GMT registration of the deputies shows 902 deputies present.

At 1445 GMT the chairman of the tellers commission takes the floor to announce the results of voting. There were 1038 voting papers in the ballot boxes. There were 467 votes for Vlasov and 535 for Yeltsin. The result is applauded and Yeltsin is seen in close up, receiving a standing ovation. Tsoy got 11 votes. Yeltsin is declared chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to more applause and jubilation in the hall.

Government Formation Debated*LD2905162890*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1451 GMT on 29 May continues to carry a recording of the 29 May session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow, at which time the protocol of the tellers commission is endorsed by a vote. More applause for Yeltsin. The decision on Yeltsin's election as chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is read, and approved after a vote. Yeltsin is invited to the presidium to loud applause and shouts.

At 1455 GMT Yeltsin takes the floor. He expresses his satisfaction, notes his responsibility for Russia, and says that a path for Russia's rebirth and reconstruction will be found. He thanks the deputies for finally reaching a decision about the chairman.

At 1502 GMT Kazakov takes the floor. He congratulates Yeltsin and thanks everybody for their cooperation. He says that there are letters asking who was pulling the strings, to which he says, nobody.

At 1507 GMT a bemedalled deputy takes the floor, and congratulates Yeltsin and everybody. All ideological opponents should be turned into colleagues, he states.

At 1509 GMT Yeltsin says that a conciliatory commission should set to work now to nominate candidates for other posts, and that a break for 36 hours ought to be announced to carry out the necessary work.

At 1511 GMT a deputy makes a proposal on members of the conciliatory commission. At 1512 GMT a deputy from the "Russian Communists" group makes another proposal on membership of the commission.

At 1513 GMT Deputy Vasilyev puts forward more proposals on the conciliatory commission.

At 1514 GMT Deputy Novikov says that the "Russian Communists" again want to suppress all others, and that Yeltsin's proposal is the only reasonable one to date.

At 1516 GMT a deputy suggests one representative from each entity should be present in the commission.

At 1517 GMT a deputy says that there are too many confrontational views, whereas consensus should be sought.

At 1520 GMT Cherepovets Babkin says that deputy representatives of the "industry" group should be included.

At 1522 GMT a deputy from Kemerovo asks for a start to electing a government now.

At 1523 GMT Deputy Zadonskiy says that there are 26 registered groups at the congress, and they should be included, along with autonomous entities.

At 1525 GMT Deputy Krestyaninov says that a commission should be formed from territories and autonomies, excluding the groups.

At 1526 GMT another deputy supports this proposal.

At 1527 GMT Deputy Urazhtsev speaks against the territorial principle, and says that Yeltsin himself can form a government.

At 1528 GMT a military deputy insists that there must be representatives from the Armed Forces and the KGB in the commission.

At 1530 GMT Zaytsev says that international experience should be consulted in such matters.

At 1531 GMT deputies put forward more proposals on further proceedings.

At 1533 GMT Deputy Plotnikov suggests that Yeltsin should form his cabinet, as is done everywhere in the world.

At 1536 GMT Deputy Gleb Yakunin says that the commission is set up to reflect the interests of all those present here, and that the main issues will be solved by voting in this hall.

At 1539 GMT Yeltsin says that his goal is to consult all the groups available at the congress to find perfect solutions. He adds more on procedural matters concerning the commission. His proposal is adopted by a vote.

At 1542 GMT a secretary makes an announcement concerning the commission and its formation.

At 1544 GMT Yeltsin proposes to restrict places for those invited to the balcony only, with the stalls reserved for RSFSR and USSR deputies. The proposal is adopted by a vote.

At 1547 GMT Yeltsin outlines procedures for tomorrow, and notes that the next meeting of the congress will be 31 May.

At 1548 GMT a correspondent interviews Yeltsin in the hall on his further strategy. He says he advocates democratic procedures. All cadre issues will be difficult to solve, as well as the issue of sovereignty. It is bound to provoke debates but this issue, and that of power, something Sakharov tried and failed to raise at the first congress, are of utmost importance. We will discuss and give our view of the latest economic measures suggested by the government.

Yeltsin Interviewed on Election, Tasks

LD2905180590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 29 May 90

[Interview with Boris Yeltsin, newly elected chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, to an unidentified correspondent in the

main conference hall following the 29 May afternoon session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] A few words, wishes to inhabitants of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] as chairman of the Supreme Soviet, please:

[Yeltsin] Wishes to the inhabitants of the RSFSR as follows: The Russian parliament has shown that it is democratic.

[Correspondent] That is gratifying, pleasing.

[Yeltsin] Democratic. Yes, yes, there are various points of view, which is perfectly natural at this time, especially in a transitional period. But even so, in its majority it is democratic, and one hopes that it will adopt laws and decisions, and so on, to the benefit of its people, to the benefit of the inhabitants of the RSFSR, to the benefit of Russia, first and foremost. This is its sacred duty to the electorate. This is the duty of every deputy, whether he happens to be an RSFSR people's deputy, a member of the Supreme Soviet, or if he is in the leadership. His duty to the electorate is most important.

[Correspondent] Your position on a coalition. How will you implement a coalition leadership and take into account the views of a minority, if that is possible, in parliament? This is undoubtedly a complicated question.

[Yeltsin] This is the first such case in our country in 73 years. In practice we have experienced this before, and today the lawyers lost their heads over how to behave in general. Therefore it is all the more difficult for the lawyers to find their position, how to [pauses]...even to form a conciliatory commission, although the chairman has the right to decide himself with which groups to seek advice and with which not to seek advice....

[Correspondent interrupts] ...Democratic presidium...

[Yeltsin] But I have decided that I will keep my word. I sought advice from all groups, and later, on the basis of some kind of a consensus, will propose such candidatures which a majority of RSFSR people's deputies at the congress would support.

[Correspondent] Tell me, which do you think will be the most complicated question from the congress' agenda? As became clear, elections for a chairman of the Supreme Soviet were very complex. Which of the next points in the congress work do you expect will entail such problems and long discussion?

[Yeltsin] Perhaps not so long, but I think that all cadre questions will not be straightforward. Cadre questions will be difficult. But of course, the next question is about sovereignty. It will cause a great deal of debate at our congress, but, on the other hand, it may result in the most important and most historic document on the sovereignty of the RSFSR and a decree on power in the RSFSR. These are two most important documents which we did not succeed in adopting—for example, the decree

of power—at the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Union, with which Sakharov came forward. There was no success. They didn't even let him finish his speech. I think there will be documents which of course will provoke much debate, but will, of course, be decisive for the sovereignty and independence of the RSFSR, and for how it will in the future conduct its own independent internal and external policy, but within the composition of the Union.

[Correspondent] Attitudes to the government measures on transferring to the market: Much is now being said about this. Union deputies want some kind of consultation with them and with the position of republican congresses.

[Yeltsin] I have already talked a bit about this—that we are in defense of the inhabitants of the RSFSR. We should express our view at the congress on this government proposal; discuss and express our views....

[Correspondent interrupts] [words indistinct].

[Yeltsin continues]...The congress, to discuss, or in some other form [pauses]...but we must express our view, that goes without saying. A wish to you [as heard] that there should be RSFSR television, and that what is filmed here in the hall should be transmitted without any cuts.

[Correspondent] Thank you. We try, in any case....

[Yeltsin interrupts] Without any. Only if the congress decides that something should not be shown. That will be decided by the congress. Nobody else, until the creation of a commission on glasnost has the right to cut even one word from the air.

Views Relations With Gorbachev

LD2905204690 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 29 May 90

[Report on interview with Boris Yeltsin, newly elected chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, by correspondents Sergey Vorobyev and Vyacheslav Terekhov in the Kremlin on 29 May—Yeltsin's recorded remarks in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] [Presenter] As you may have heard in the news Boris Yeltsin has been elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet of this country's largest republic, the Russian Federation. Immediately after he met with Soviet and foreign newsmen in the Moscow Kremlin. Radio Moscow's Sergey Vorobyev and Vyacheslav Terekhov had many questions to ask. One was this: will the political situation in this country change now that you've been elected?

[Yeltsin] Yes, I believe so. It will definitely change. The situation will change because most people looked forward to learning what the congress would decide. I believe the situation will grow more stable, even against

a backdrop of the unpopular proposals the government has put forward to radicalize the economic reform.

[Presenter] Another question: How must Russia build relations with the Baltic republics?

Boris Yeltsin believes Russia must be the first to sign treaties with these republics, and it must then sign treaties with all other republics on an equal footing.

How are you going to build relations with the Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, Boris Yeltsin was asked.

[Yeltsin] I want them to be businesslike and immune to confrontation. I want dialogue and talks on a principled basis to meet the interests of Russia and not to damage its sovereignty.

[Presenter] Do you expect the Soviet president, now in Canada, to extend congratulations?

[Yeltsin] He couldn't imagine this yesterday but it would be politically right for the president to extend congratulations today.

[Presenter] Asked who would become the Russian Federation's prime minister, Boris Yeltsin explained that a conciliatory commission had been set up for that purpose. He said the commission represented the various groups of MPs [Members of Parliament] and various national territorial entities. It will meet this coming Wednesday [30 May] to iron out the differences at the current congress.

And there was this question: Were you sure of victory? Boris Yeltsin said there was hope but no confidence. What kind of media does Russia need? Boris Yeltsin: independent and acting on an alternative basis. Asked if he had any health problems, Boris Yeltsin said that he felt all right. The only thing that he was still forbidden to do since he had his surgery in Spain was playing tennis.

Views Sovereignty

*LD2905194290 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 29 May 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Here is the first interview of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin in his capacity as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the republic which he gave to (Yelena Ozerina), correspondent of the main editorial office for television programs for Russia. [video shows Yeltsin seated at bench in the auditorium alongside other deputies]

[Begin recording] [Yeltsin] Well, of course, there's no hiding the feeling of satisfaction, but there is more of a sense of great responsibility for the fact that Russia, thanks to the efforts of the deputy corps, the Supreme Soviet, the leadership, really should....

[(Ozerina)], interrupting] I don't understand.

[Yeltsin continues] ...(?to be reborn) in all respects.

Sovereignty means independence—independence from the bottom to the top, from the most...village, rural, rayon soviet and so on, to the Russian Soviet, the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. Such an independence that there is priority for Russian laws and the Russian Constitution over Union laws. This is the main thing. Sovereignty means independent internal and external policies and the right to conclude any, also including international, contracts with any country in the world. Sovereignty means that Russians are to solve their own problems themselves. [end recording]

Yeltsin Opens Conciliation Commission

*LD3005073790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0630 GMT 30 May 90*

[Excerpt] [Correspondent Ruvinskiy] [passage omitted] The conciliation commission is sitting in the Georgiyevskiy Hall. This consists of 166 people representing groups of deputies as well as national and territorial formations. The session was opened by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. I was able to attend the first minutes of this meeting; then all representatives of the press were asked to leave the hall. Boris Nikolayevich said proposals are to be jointly worked out on candidacies for first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, three deputies, and the leaders of a number of Russian central organisations. It was suggested that the people's deputies put forward candidacies for the post of first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. After that I had to leave the hall, but I think that we shall nevertheless be informing our listeners during the day and that we shall find an opportunity to tell you about the session of this commission.

Let us hope that this Georgiyevskiy Hall—a symbol of our military victories—will become a symbol of another important victory, a victory of the unification of all our republic's democratic forces. I shall end my report on that for the time being.

More on Commission

*LD3005102890 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT
30 May 90*

[by TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 30—A conciliatory commission, including representatives of various deputy groups and autonomous formations, has been set up at the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation.

It aims to choose candidates for the first deputy and deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, prime minister and other republic's leaders and to agree on principles to form the Supreme Soviet, a permanent legislative body.

Russia's Constitution empowers the president of the Supreme Soviet to nominate candidates for these posts on his own. But Boris Yeltsin, elected head of the Russian Parliament yesterday, proposed convening a conciliatory commission. The decision reflects the complicated situation in the Russian parliament.

The president is in an awkward situation himself. Yeltsin won only in the third round of elections, receiving 535 votes. 502 voted against him.

Yeltsin's personal victory testifies to his popularity, but it does not mean a victory for the radical Democratic Russia bloc, although he is the bloc's leader. The analysis, conducted at the congress on the results of roll-call votes, reveals that the bloc is supported by some 35 percent of the deputies, while their opponents have 45 percent.

Voting at the congress will depend on those deputies who do not align themselves with either of the two dominant blocs.

In his first speech as head of the Russian parliament yesterday, Yeltsin called for national reconciliation. The conciliatory commission's meeting today is the first step along this challenging path.

3,000 Turn Out To Celebrate Yeltsin Victory

AU2905195590 Paris AFP in English 1941 GMT
29 May 90

[Text] Moscow, May 29 (AFP)—About 3,000 people rallied outside the Kremlin and at a Moscow stadium Tuesday to celebrate the election of radical communist Boris Yeltsin as Russian president, AFP correspondents reported.

But the number of demonstrators were less than expected by organisers from pro-democracy movements, and Mr. Yeltsin cancelled planned speeches to the rallies.

Some people said they had been prevented from reaching the demonstration in central Moscow by police. Police have enforced a ban on central demonstrations in recent weeks.

Mr. Yeltsin was elected president of the Russian parliament by obtaining 535 votes, four more than the 50 per cent majority required.

He defeated a candidate supported by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, Alexander Vlasov, who won 467 votes.

TASS Outlines Yeltsin Biography

LD2905124690 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT
29 May 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The leader of the radical Democratic Russia bloc, Boris Yeltsin, 59, was elected

the new president of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet today.

Yeltsin was born on February 1, 1931, in the village of Butka, Sverdlovsk Region in the South Urals. In 1955, he graduated from the Ural Polytechnic as a construction engineer. For several years Yeltsin worked in various building organisations in the city of Sverdlovsk.

Yeltsin joined the Soviet Communist Party in 1961 and began a full-time party career in 1968. He worked as sector head and secretary and in 1976-1985 as head of the Sverdlovsk Regional Party Committee.

In 1985, Yeltsin joined the apparatus of the party Central Committee and soon became a Central Committee secretary. In December 1985, Moscow communists elected him their leader. From 1986 to 1989 Yeltsin was an alternate, non-voting, member of the politburo.

In autumn 1987, Yeltsin was relieved of his duties as head of the City Party Committee at the organisations' plenary meeting. Speakers at the plenum criticised Yeltsin for his "tough style" of management and accused him of "decimating cadres". Soon he lost his Politburo job as well but remained a member of the party Central Committee.

The punished leader remained popular among Muscovites, who elected him a USSR people's deputy in 1989. In the national parliament he was placed in charge of the Construction Committee.

Yeltsin is a co-chairman of the opposition Interregional Group of Deputies.

Yeltsin was elected a people's deputy of the Russian Federation from Sverdlovsk this spring. He is the actual leader of the radical Democratic Russia bloc, representatives of which make up, according to unofficial statistics, about one third of the Russian Federation MP's [members of parliament].

Yeltsin recently visited many foreign countries. During his trips he set out his own vision of perestroika problems in the USSR. According to western analysts, Yeltsin is the "antagonist" of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Presenting his programme to the Russian congress, however, Yeltsin said he was not seeking confrontation.

Yeltsin's wife Naina is a retired construction engineer. The Russian parliamentary leader has two daughters. One is a construction engineer, the other is a cyberneticist. The Yeltsin family has two grand-daughters and a grand-son.

Asked about his hobby, Yeltsin responds without a moment's hesitation: "tennis".

Congress Passes Resolution on Chernobyl*LD2905122890 Moscow TASS in English 1221 GMT
29 May 90*

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Excerpts] Moscow May 29 TASS—The leader of the Radical Democratic Russia bloc, Boris Yeltsin, 59, is the new president of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted]

At its morning session, the congress passed a resolution on urgent measures to eliminate the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant in the Russian regions that were affected by radio active contamination. They were declared "zones of national ecological disaster."

The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet was instructed to discuss at its next session measures to clean up the Chernobyl accident aftermath in the republic. The program must also include measures to clean up nuclear fallout in the Chelyabinsk region (Urals) in 1957 and the impact of many years of nuclear tests at a test range in Semipalatinsk on the population of the Altay territory.

The next meeting of the congress is scheduled for Thursday.

RSFSR Deputy Premier Trubilin Retires*PM2905142390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 25 May 90 Single Edition p 5*

[Unattributed report: "In the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Comrade Nikolay Timofeyevich Trubilin from the post of deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers on his retirement on pension.

Reportage on Moscow City Food Restrictions**Guidelines Detailed***LD2805032490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0300 GMT 28 May 90*

[Text] Beginning today, all Moscow shops will be selling goods only on the presentation of a passport with a capital or oblast permit. It is planned to set up special shops in the capital for visitors and those on business. Supplies of food to refugees are envisaged. Members of large families will be able to buy goods according to an increased quota. The existing arrangements still apply to the handicapped and war veterans, including visitors. A standard procedure for issuing products has been introduced for canteens and buffet bars.

All these measures will apply for two weeks. During that time, the USSR Supreme Soviet is due to adopt a

definite decision on the program presented by the government. Then the Moscow Soviet will be able to work out a stable system of measures for the whole interim period.

Bars Sales to Non-Residents*AU2505171390 Paris AFP in English 1702 GMT
25 May 90*

[Text] Moscow, May 25 (AFP)—The Moscow city government decided as expected Friday to bar food sales to non-residents due to the current rush on food stores, Radio Moscow's INTERFAX bulletin announced here.

INTERFAX said that residents would have to show a passport proving residence to buy food, and that the measure would be applicable starting Saturday, for two weeks.

Moscow Mayor Gavril Popov said earlier Friday that the national government's announcement of price rises in connection with economic reforms had given rise to "a very difficult situation in the food supply sector."

The measure adopted here is similar to the one that has been in effect for months in Leningrad to keep out hordes of consumers from Baltic countries, and the Baltic republics themselves have taken such steps.

For the last two days, Soviet citizens have been buying any food they can lay hands on.

More on Food Sale Limits*LD2605042990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0330 GMT 26 May 90*

[Text] At the first session of the people's deputies of the Moscow City Soviet on 25 May, there was a stormy debate on the economic situation in the capital. Popov, chairman of Moscow city soviet, reported that many of the capital's shops had already sold their month's stock of tea, sugar, groats, flour, eggs, macaroni, and other items. For the purpose of stabilizing the market and restricting the removal of foodstuffs from Moscow and Moscow Oblast, Chairman Lushkov of the Moscow city soviet executive committee proposed the commencement on 27 May of the sale of goods only on presentation of Moscow and Moscow Oblast registration passports. Comrades Popov, Stankevich, and Lushkov are planning to give Soviet and foreign journalists a more detailed explanation of the emergency measures being adopted by the city authorities at a press conference today.

The session of the Moscow City Soviet deputies also adopted another important decision: to halt work on the construction of the Severnaya heating and power station.

Kalinin Oblast Protests Moscow Purchasing Rules

LD2905105490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1000 GMT 29 May 90

[Text] A protest has been sent to the Moscow City Soviet and the Moscow Oblast Executive Committee about their decision to change the rules for selling food and industrial goods in Moscow and its oblasts. This protest was sent by the Kalinin Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies Presidium, the oblast (?industrial council), and the executive committee of the oblast soviet. They demand that these rules be lifted immediately. In the event of a decision against Kalinin's liking, supplies of animal products to Moscow will be temporarily halted from 1 June, and a system of sale of goods only to people registered in Kalinin will be introduced.

Correspondent Discusses Moscow Food Rationing

LD2605161390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1222 GMT 26 May 90

[Text] [Announcer] In Moscow it is 1622 [1222 GMT] today. I have already recounted that a discussion developed on the economic situation in the capital among of the Moscow city soviet people's deputies at the sitting, which took place yesterday. The discussion centered on the fact that in many shops, large monthly reserves of food have been sold, and, in the interest of stabilizing the market situation, it was proposed initiating very quickly the sale of goods on the production of a passport. Today in the Moscow soviet a news conference has taken place for journalists devoted to just this issue. Our special correspondent Vladimir Korablev is there. He has just called our studio and has linked up with us in Ostankino. Hello there, Vladimir!

[Korablev] Hello! I have already managed to travel from the Moscow city soviet to the Great Kremlin Palace, where the First Congress of [RSFSR] People's Deputies is in session, and just at this moment People's Deputy Stankevich, first deputy chairman of Moscow City Soviet, is addressing deputies on this very topic. At the news conference, the leadership of Moscow city soviet described the fairly difficult economic situation that has come about in the capital in recent days, and the measures that Moscow city soviet has been forced to adopt in this connection.

[Announcer] Vladimir (?Ivanovich), given the great interest in this problem, perhaps you might say what were the reasons for this decision of the Moscow city soviet.

[Korablev] I want to say first of all that from Monday the 27th of May [as heard] sale of foodstuffs in Moscow will be affected on production of a passport only to inhabitants of Moscow and Moscow Oblast. And what has brought about this decision? Popov, chairman of the Moscow soviet, explained in his speech that in recent months the situation in the capital's trade has not been easy.

[Announcer] Excuse me, Vladimir, the 27th or the 28th? Because the 27th is a Sunday, tomorrow.

[Korablev] Forgive me, from Monday, the 28th. Yes, 28 May. Today and tomorrow free sale is going on without the production of passports. To go back to what we were saying, the situation in the capital's trade network deteriorated particularly after the speech at the third session of the Supreme Soviet by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, on the concept for the transition to a regulated market economy. After this speech, terrible panic buying began in the capital.

[Announcer] Everything is being bought up?

[Korablev] Everything is being bought up! You know, the impression I got is that many people have grasped that prices are to go up, but no one has been interested in going into the heart of the reform. Speaking at the news conference, Yuriy Mikhaylovich Luzhkov, chairman of the Executive Committee of Moscow city soviet, said that one-and-a-half month's worth...a month's worth of goods were sold in Moscow in just one-and-a-half days. For instance, sales of flour and vegetable oil went up by 700-800 percent. Sales of salt almost doubled. In this situation, at the request of the City Trade Union Council, the Moscow city soviet session adopted a decision, which I mentioned earlier. But I would like to note right away this decision will be in effect for just two weeks. In that time, the Moscow city soviet will work out a number of specific measures to sort out the state of affairs in the trade network, and the proposals of deputies will be tabled for discussion by Muscovites. Following the referendum, decisions will be adopted for the longer term. So, I stress once again that these are temporary measures designed to last just two weeks.

[Announcer] Vladimir, here is another question, which, to judge by telephone calls to the office, very many listeners are interested in; two questions, in fact. First, will this not give rise to a situation of conflict in Moscow, because Moscow is a city to which a very large number of people travel from, say, Yaroslavl, Vladimir, and the oblast in general, to buy their food in Moscow? After all, it is no great secret that many provincial towns are simply a land of semi-starvation. Second, what will the actual procedure for going over to a passport shopping system, so to speak, be like?

[Korablev] You know, this matter was the object of very serious discussion at the Moscow city soviet session. Very many people also asked questions on this matter at today's news conference. At this precise moment deputies are putting questions on this very matter to Stankevich, deputy chairman of the Moscow city soviet. What compromise decision was found on this? Well, there are going to be several shops in Moscow where residents of nearby oblasts will be able to come and buy foodstuffs, as authorized by their town or oblast soviets. This will have no effect on Great Fatherland War invalids and labor veterans. They will be able to travel to Moscow and to use their own identity cards to buy

foodstuffs in any of the capital's shops. I would also like to say that if someone does not have a passport...

[Announcer, interrupting] Vladimir, forgive me, but we have no more than a minute of airtime left.

[Korablev] I am just finishing. I want to say that if someone does not have a passport—and this will apply to refugees among others—special departments will be opened in the shops, in which they will be able to purchase the requisite quantity of foodstuffs.

[Announcer] Without a passport?

[Korablev] Without a passport. But as for the actual procedure...

[Announcer, interrupting] One can assume some sort of document will see the light of day, because they will have to confirm their refugee status?

[Korablev] No, you know, even if someone has arrived without any document, he will be able to purchase the necessary ration of food in any shop. I also want to say that the procedure itself will take place as follows. It was explained at the news conference that on entering a shop, you will show your passport, and in self-service shops you will present your passport to the supervisor. Evidently, certain limits will be placed on the amount of goods that can be released to individual customers. More details will be given about that in the papers. That is the end of my report on the news conference in Moscow city soviet and the question currently being discussed at the Congress of People's Deputies.

RSFSR Democratic Party Sets Out Program

*LD2605201190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 26 May 90*

[Text] The first day of work of the constituent conference of the Democratic Party of the Russian Federation for the transitional period has taken place in Moscow. Those who gathered to set it up comprised 351 delegates from 67 towns of the RSFSR.

What can be said about the main tasks of the new party? The chief ones are: the creation of Russian statehood in the form of a democratic republic; the adoption of a new constitution for Russia; decentralization of state management on the basis of rule by the people and various forms of local self-management; de-ideologization of science, education, and culture; in the economic sphere, free enterprise, variety in all forms of ownership, and development of market relations without lowering living standards for the population, through reductions in spending on military and other official purposes; and private ownership of land. [In a further report, Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 26 May in the "Vremya" newscast says of the RSFSR Democratic Party Congress: "The participants were unanimous that the Democratic Party of Russia must be based on an anti-communist platform. Its purpose is to dismantle in the Soviet federation the power that was

established 73 years ago. That is precisely why certain participants suggested that the Democratic Party of Russia should be regarded as a party of the so-called transitional period."]

More on Congress

*LD2705195390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1700 GMT 27 May 90*

[Text] The inaugural congress of the Democratic Party of the Russian Federation for the transitional period has finished its work in Moscow just now. The founding chapter has been adopted. Nikolay Ilyich Travkin has become its chairman. Kiriill Shakhnovich, our correspondent reports.

[Shakhnovich] A great interest for this congress has been shown. There have been 351 delegates from 67 towns of our country. And such well-known social and political organizations as Shield, Memorial, Union of Kuzbass Workers, several members of the CPSU Democratic Platform, deputies from all three levels, and a number of other social and political organizations have taken part in the congress' work. In some aspects, the work of the congress resembled the congress of the Social Democratic Party which was taking place in this building just recently. The Leningrad deputies have also disagreed with the organization committee's suggestion about the leadership structure of the new party. A number of speakers were defending an idea of this party being, first of all, a party which is an alternative to the CPSU and at the same time the others were also saying that the people who have left the CPSU and joined the Democratic Party could strengthen it intellectually. Among the party's leaders are Nikolay Travkin, about whom one of the speakers said he is pretender to the role of the Russian Walensa. Gennadiy Burbulis. I now present you with an interview with Gary Kasparov.

[Begin recording] [Shakhnovich] What has prompted you, the world chess champion, to engage in such political activity?

[Kasparov] Now the situation is such that I think people are starting to engage themselves in the activity, independently from their views, professions, convictions. Now it is necessary to attempt consolidation of the democratic forces. This is really a consolidation on some party basis which could have made easier the transition period from the present situation to a normal democratic society with the market economy.

[Shakhnovich] The name of the party, party of the transitional period, has precisely such meaning?

[Kasparov] Yes, this is precisely the task of the party in the transitional period because, sadly, at the moment nobody is talking about it. Everybody is talking about how gloriously they will function in a society with a constitution and civil liberties.

[Shakhnovich] And the main aims of this party? Let's say, the difference from the parties which have been formed in the past few months.

[Kasparov] One of the tasks that, let's say, makes it different is speeding up the privatization of the economy. In our view the hardships that our Soviet people will be enduring in the process of transition to the market economy should be borne by the state. All the main funds should be, naturally, privatized and the money thus obtained should be sent to the social security fund with the lowering of tax, because only with this condition the economy can thrust forward. In the main, the Democratic Parties' programs are similar, they cannot be different, there are not so many values in the world which could be put into one or the other program, but we are simply suggesting some radical measures connected precisely with a radical restructuring of economic and ideological spheres. In other words, we want to do this more speedily and we are suggesting some organizational structures which could support the country's economy.

[Shakhnovich] Here in the corridors people are talking about the future participation of Afanasiev and Artem Tarasov in your party. Is some coalition with them possible?

[Kasparov] I think that Afanasiev should come to us, we have something to talk about. I hope that Yuriy Nikolayevich will not pass us up in his attention and will join our ranks, he and his supporters. As for Artem Tarasov, as you know the union of cooperatives are now forming the Party of Free Labor, the party which, in general, is very close to ours in their views. And to date an agreement has been reached about the joint actions, and it is not ruled out that we shall see Artem Tarasov a member of our party. This is quite possible. [end recording]

Russian Komsomol Congress Continues Work

LD2905204390 Moscow TASS in English 1929 GMT
29 May 90

[By TASS special correspondents Galina Vinitskaya and Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The First Congress of the Leninist Young Communist League (Komsomol) of the Russian Federation, the largest Soviet republic, continues its work here.

Following debates, which have taken on a sharp edge from the first minutes of the congress, participants endorsed the statutes of the Youth League. Proposals by part of the delegates to remove the words "Leninist" and "communist" from the name of the organisation were rejected by the absolute majority of votes.

Under the adopted statutes, the Komsomol of the Russian Federation is the independent sociopolitical organisation uniting on the voluntary principles young people of the communist and socialist orientation. Respect for

the rights of minorities is one principle of the league. The interests of the minority are ensured by "the right to uphold their stance and to gain organisational independence to the point of secession."

Delegates also adopted a programme of the Russian Komsomol. It describes creating conditions for a comprehensive development of the young man, for bringing out his creative potential, protecting and implementing young people's interests as the league's principal goals.

The programme of the Russian Komsomol also includes several initiatives. Specifically, the organisation favours the adoption of the republican law on youth, forming a republican bloc of leftist forces standing on positions of the socialist choice, and also holding a referendum on the republic's flag and anthem.

The congress is expected to form the league's central bodies and elect the leader of the Russian Komsomol tomorrow.

The Russian Democratic Socialist Association, which seceded from the Young Communist League of the Russian Federation on Monday, is holding a founding congress in parallel with the forum of the Russian Komsomol.

Its participants are discussing the draft statutes and platform of this "independent political organisation". Thirty two certificates of this association have already been issued.

New Youth Group Formed

LD2905063990 Moscow TASS in English 2054 GMT
28 May 90

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Young people of the Russian Federation will probably soon have another public and political organisation. It was announced today at the second stage of the congress of the Young Communist League (Komsomol) of the biggest Soviet republic that the group of the Russian Democratic Socialist Association withdraws from the Komsomol and forms an independent political organization.

Its leader Aleksandr Bek, who spoke on behalf of 60 out of some 900 delegates to the congress, said that the constituent congress of the association began on Monday night.

The Leninist Communist Alliance of the Russian Youth was proclaimed last February at the first stage of the congress of Komsomol organisations of the Russian Federation. At the same time, a group of delegates announced the creation in the new organisation of a group of the Russian Democratic Socialist Association with its own rules and programme principles.

The association does not regard Marxism as its ideological foundation and supports "the destruction of the totalitarian system and the creation of society based on

parliamentary democracy, law and a multi-party system". Its draft platform says that "in its activities it is orientated towards a bloc of organisations and structures of democratic and socialist nature and not towards any single party".

Aleksandr Bek could not give in a TASS interview even an approximate number of supporters of the association. He said that it would become clear only after the constituent congress.

Vladimir Zyukin, first secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Young Communist League (Komsomol), described the creation of the new organisation as a manifestation of pluralism in the youth movement. Addressing a press conference held during a break between the sittings of the congress, he said that Komsomol was ready to render the association financial and material assistance during its formation.

Delegates to the congress of the Russian Komsomol began to discuss draft rules of their organization on Monday. The congress will continue its work on Tuesday.

Worker-Peasant Union Forms in RSFSR

90UN1945A Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 23 May 90 p 1

[Report by special correspondent S. Kredov: "Worker Deputies, in the Minority in the Russian Congress, Not Concerned for Dictatorship"]

[Text] If the reader recalls, we made space available in our newspaper just prior to the start of the congress to three deputies from the Kuzbass, miners, activists who last year had conducted miners' strikes. During the discussion it seemed to me that, attuned to radical, decisive changes in the republic, they should unreservedly have been associating with the opposition bloc which had already taken shape. This assumption proved inaccurate. And confirmation of this is the creation of the "Worker-Peasant Union" group. Aleksandr Bir, member of the workers' committee from Novokuznetsk and deputy of the city soviet, has been elected its coordinator. I asked him to describe the tasks of the "Worker-Peasant Union."

"All programs, whoever they are proposed by in the congress," Aleksandr Fridrikhovich said, "will be based in one way or another on the immediate producers, that is, the workers and peasants in the first instance. Consequently, in parliament we also should have our particular representation. Statistical data are dispiriting: Among the 1,000-plus deputies there are only 59 of us, that is less than six percent. True, 72 persons have appended their signatures to the group's documents.

"Our union is the sole group formed along not professional but class lines. However, this should not be seen as

a 'threat.' We aspire not to hegemony, not to dictatorship, but to the defense of the basic productive forces of the republic."

"It is no secret what in past years explained government officials' 'love' for worker-peasant representatives in the executive authorities: the latter lack sufficient knowledge and are impressible, and it is easier to control them. Will not your group become a toy in others' hands?"

"No way. The majority of us are people with their own position. More than half the union's members, incidentally, have higher education.... We intend to distribute our program documents and to speak from the congress rostrum. Thus I have been entrusted with making an announcement on the question of the republic's sovereignty. We hope that on this occasion the speakers will be chosen not by territory but by deputy group. After all, so much time has already been lost on speeches on particular regional problems!"

....It was resolved yesterday in the congress to terminate debate on the government report on the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] socioeconomic situation, in which approximately 50 deputies had spoken in two days. A.V. Vlasov, chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers, answered questions. The congress then embarked on examination of the question of RSFSR sovereignty, a new Union treaty and the mechanism of power of the people in the republic.

Commission Discusses Aral Sea Pollution Problems

PM2805144590 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 23 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by M. Ganiyev, N. Prokofyeva on ecological situation in Aral region]

[Text] [Announcer] In March-April "Vremya" screened a series of reports about the ecological catastrophe in the Aral region. Our special correspondents Nataliya Prokofyeva and Mukhtar Ganiyev reported at the time on the calamitous situation in that area. These reports met with a response not only from you, comrade television viewers, but also from those who have a duty to attend to these problems by dint of their profession.

An itinerant session of the USSR Council of Ministers Commission for Emergency Situations has been held in Nukus. Here is a report from Nukus by our special correspondents.

[Prokofyeva] And so we return to the Aral region. Before meeting to discuss the emergency situation which has developed here, members of the commission—they include representatives of Central Asian republics, scientists, heads of ministries and departments, and representatives of public organizations—visited the places where the ecological tragedy is blatantly obvious.

This is Muynak. A dying city on the banks of the former sea. The water has disappeared, and people are leaving.

[video shows abandoned houses, deserted streets, members of the commission in conversation with those who remain] During the past two decades the number of inhabitants here has decreased by one-third.

[M. Ganiyev] These ships, lying on the bottom of the dried up sea are being dismantled. [video shows rusty shipwrecks] They will be smelted and turned into something that people can use. But what will happen to the city? People who have lived here for a long time relate that more than one commission has been here. But an answer is still awaited. There are deserted streets, abandoned houses, people's faces reflect dismay and worry. [video shows scenes of desolation]. A grand hotel complex which never came into use stands on the former shore of the sea which has retreated, a monument, as it were, to past mismanagement. [video shows hotel complex]

[Prokofyeva] [video shows map of Aral Sea] The sea is losing 35,000 cubic km of water annually through evaporation, while only 1,700 cubic km of water flow into it. At present, the Amu-Darya's water never reaches the Aral. How can the situation be saved? This was discussed at the conference in Nukus. The conference was addressed by commission members, representatives of the public, and scientists. [video shows shots of the conference and interview with unidentified commission member]

[M. Ganiyev] What conclusions has the commission reached?

[Unidentified commission member] It is difficult to give a clear-cut answer to this question. I will try and formulate a number of conclusions reached by the commission.

The first conclusion is that quite a lot is being done to solve the problem of the Aral Sea. The second conclusion is that what is being done is insufficient, as regards resolving both the Aral problem and the problem of providing people with normal living conditions. Incidentally, we put the second half of this problem first, because saving the Aral is not a problem that can be resolved overnight, it will take time, but people must be provided with normal conditions as quickly as possible. This is why I said that there is no simple answer to this question. And the third conclusion we have reached is that we must do even more, and specifically that we must draw up a comprehensive program, so that people are not dealing with partial problems in isolation, without knowing what the other side is doing. And so it has been decided to draw up a comprehensive program of action on the Aral by the end of the year....

[Announcer] It seems to me that the solution of this problem brooks no delay, every day counts here.

Pollution Detected in Khotkovo Water Supply

PM2805145390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 24 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] We received an alarm signal today from the city of Khotkovo near Moscow. The local

sanitation and epidemiology station conducted an analysis of the tap water and discovered phenol. The "Elektrozolit" [name as heard] Production Association is the main culprit. There is an alarming environmental situation within the area around the city as a whole. On the initiative of the local Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organization, an environmental rally was held in Khotkovo, in which deputies from the newly elected soviet took part.

Gorkiy Soviet To End Power Station Project

LD2505081190 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0449 GMT 24 May 90

[Excerpt] Gorkiy, 24 May (TASS)—TASS correspondents Rena Kuznetsova and Evald Kessariyskiy report:

The town Soviet of People's Deputies has decided to halt further construction of the Gorkiy atomic heat-supply station, the first such station in the world. Before this, tens of thousands of inhabitants of the ancient town on the Volga spoke out against commissioning of the station, the main capital construction of which was virtually completed. Specialists think that 75 percent of work has been completed.

A final decision on the fate of the station, which is located five kilometers from housing estates, will be made by the Government of the Soviet Union.

A session of the town soviet discussed problems connected with the fate of both the station itself and its service personnel. There is a suggestion to convert the station on the Volga into an educational center or to re-design it to run on organic fuel. In both cases, the problem of providing employment for people would be resolved at the same time. [passage omitted]

Voronezh Voters Reject Nuclear Plant

PM2905091390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 90 p 2

[Report by our correspondent V. Tkachuk under the general heading "Chronicle of the Week": "Voronezh"]

[Text] Voronezh people have surely never shown such conscious unanimity before. A referendum was held in the city 15 May on the construction of a nuclear heat supply station [AST] and more than 500,000 people supported the ending of work at the Voronezh AST site. Some 81.5 percent of Voronezh people took part in the vote with only 2.1 percent in favor of the station.

Thus the public's opinion is known but the fate of the nuclear station will settled once and for all by the next session of the city soviet.

A surprising discovery was made by those Voronezh people who came to a meeting with Pamyat leader Dmitriy Vasilyev: All our present-day problems have

been created artificially. Apparently, the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" planned the Soviet economic crisis and other difficulties 100 years ago. If we do not unite around Pamyat, Russia will be destroyed by the Zionists by the year 2000. The Vasilyev patriots, in the words of their leader himself, are anything but anti-Semites, (they like Arabs, for example), they are just anti-Zionists. D. Vasilyev claimed that attempts are being made to discredit him and the true Pamyat by the pogrom-like attacks on Central House of Literature committed by the two other bogus Pamyat organizations specially created for that purpose by Politburo member A. Yakovlev and the KGB.

The two-hour monologue by the populist-orthodox monarchist, occasionally marred by an absence of logic and common sense, eventually bored the audience and they left.

Kalinin Oblast First Secretary Retires

PM3005123390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Oblast Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Kalinin, 28 May—A plenum of Kalinin CPSU Obkom [Oblast Party Committee] was held to examine an organizational question.

The plenum released N.F. Tatarchuk, first secretary of the party obkom, of his duties in connection with his retirement on pension. The plenum expressed its gratitude to N.F. Tatarchuk for his conscientious work in the oblast party organization.

The question of electing a CPSU obkom first secretary will be examined at the forthcoming oblast party conference.

North Ossetians Demonstrate, Appeal to Gorbachev

LD2505190190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1130 GMT 25 May 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Summary] The following report was received yesterday, following a report on the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies citing a demand by Deputy Bogatyrev on 23 May that land given to Northern Ossetia at the end of the war should be returned to the Ingushet people.

[Correspondent I. Tabolova, identified by caption]: The rally in which approximately 100,000 people took part, according to the data of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, started spontaneously. Together with members of the Ossetian international meeting, members of the Greek-Georgian-Cossack national and cultural community clubs, representing the main groups in the town, took part in the meeting and made speeches, expressed a unity of positions on the inviolability of the frontiers of Russia and its autonomous formations.

D.K. Penkovskiy, who claims to be a historian, states that in 1923 according to the census, 41,000 Russians, 9,000 Ossetians, 7,000 Armenians, 4,000 Georgians, 1,500 Persians, 1,500 Greeks, and (?501) Ingushets lived in Vladikavkaz.

[Tabolova] The participants in the rally unanimously adopted an appeal to the country's President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and to the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, in which a unity of will of the peoples of Northern Ossetia was expressed regarding the inviolability of the republic's frontiers and in support of the laws adopted by the country's Supreme Soviet.

(The video shows the many-thousand-strong demonstration being addressed by Penkovskiy and other speakers)

Donetsk Oblast Elects Congress Delegates

LD2605221490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 26 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] After a break of more than a month, the Donetsk oblast party conference resumed its work today. The conference summed up the pre-congress discussion in the Donetsk oblast party organization, one of the five largest in the country. There is no split among party ranks. The delegates noted that the overwhelming majority of the Donbass communists support the CPSU platform and favor of a united Communist Party of the country.

Of over 400 candidates in party constituencies, 87 delegates to the 28th party congress were elected. It was noticed that, although the Donbass is an industrial mining region, the number of delegates from among the workers is insignificant. Paid party officials account for nearly half the delegation. Yevgeniy Vasilyevich Mironov, first secretary of the party oblast committee, said with concern that if the CPSU does not listen to and express the demands of the present-day workers movement, workers will set up a political organization of their own.

Myakota Continues Poltava Oblast Post

LD2605170290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0700 GMT 26 May 90

[Text] An oblast party conference has concluded in Poltava. Communists discussed the political situation that has arisen in the country and outlined the main directions of the work of the oblast party organization. Aleksey Sergeyevich Myakota was reelected the first secretary of the oblast party committee on the basis of more than one candidate.

Fire Causes Closure of Vorkuta Mine

LD2905181290 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT
29 May 90

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Vorkuta, Northern Russia May 29 TASS—The Vorkutinskaya mine of the Vorkutaugol amalgamation is out of operation for the third day owing to a continuing fire that began during blasting operations.

A methane burst occurred in the worked-out area in of [as received] longwalls and a fire flared up on Sunday morning, killing two miners.

Ten miners sustained various injuries and burns. They all were hospitalized and some of them are in serious condition. Efforts are now under way to localise the fire and to extinguish it.

A special commission involving representatives of the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry was set up to find out the circumstances of the accident.

Russian Separatism Movement Discussed

PM2905090990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 May 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Aleksandr Tsipko under the rubric "Political Diary": "Russians Leaving Russia?"]

[Text] You will agree that the development of events in the first days of the Congress of Russian People's Deputies has acquired an unexpected nature. The people's elected representatives, contrary to many expectations, not only failed to display alarm and concern in connection with the nascent disintegration of their thousand-years-old state but on the contrary began in a concerted manner, in single formation, and in a transport of emotion, to push it toward the abyss of separation. Taking over from the Balts, the Russian deputies began their run along the path of self-determination and state independence.

Was imitation hysteria at work? The slogan of Russian money took over from the slogan of Estonian money and our Russian women deputies, like K. Prunskiene, began seeking the participation of representatives "of an independent Russia in the United Nations." And indeed, in what way are we Russians worse than the others? If we're going to have sovereignty, let's have it. We too were not born yesterday, we too will seek state independence. Perhaps only the elected representatives of the Russian autonomous bodies displayed wisdom and opposed this divisive elemental force as best they could.

What only a year ago was seen as the *idee fixe* of the new Russophile movement is today, however strange it may seem, becoming a political reality. Many Russian deputies are seriously seeking the withdrawal of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] from the USSR, displaying total indifference toward what will

happen on the bulk of Soviet territory. That has never happened before in Russian history.

Of course, in the passionate talk of full Russian sovereignty, Russian money, and the sovereignty of every rayon and every plant much comes from politics, from the desire to win power. It is not so much a struggle for Russia's sovereignty that is under way, not so much a fight against unitarism, as opposition to Gorbachev. Those who lost to him at Union level are seeking revenge at the Russian level.

In this unreasoning, instinctive desire for Russia's isolation and separation much also emanates from the present state of the Russian soul. Russians do not feel anything Russian in Soviet history, in Soviet life. That is why in their mass (as the congress has shown) they do not see in the history of the USSR the continuation of the history of their own Russian state. Hence, probably, the instinctive desire to leave the USSR as an enforced and alien community. Hence the failure to see that the RSFSR is essentially a transformed Russia, that it is impossible to leave the USSR without finally destroying Russia.

Soviet history has indeed been the direct continuation of Russian history. But nonetheless everything which has been Russian since time immemorial—culture, traditions, faith—was rooted out for decades. Stalin remembered Russia and Russia's sacred places only when the Germans were near Moscow.... That is probably why there is nothing surprising in the fact that the Russian self-awareness which is now re-emerging is so impulsive. The rupturing of the Russian people's memory is being overcome with difficulty. People are still living by myths, believing that their state did indeed emerge only in 1917.

Many Russians have forgotten not only that they are Russian but also that they are Slavs, that they are linked by a single common destiny with the Ukrainians and the Belorussians, that they bear the main responsibility for the Slavs of Kievan Russia. Incidentally, it is not only the Russian deputies but also the new Russophile theorists who have forgotten their Slav genealogy. They pay little consideration to the fact that their gamble on the myth of the Russian community and Russian conciliarism essentially leads to the split of Slavic Russia, that no Slav can be lured by a fanatical struggle against private ownership.

Some deputies, furiously seeking full sovereignty for Russia at the congress, are failing to take into account the response which their separatist passions and sentiments evokes in the hearts of, for instance, Ukrainians or Belorussians. After all the Ukrainians, like the Russians, have no need of anything, after all they can also live both independently and affluently with their own resources. And live no worse than the Russians. But what will remain of the USSR is the Ukrainians and Belorussians and then the Kazakhs, Uzbeks, and others begin to think

and act in the way that many Russian people's deputies are acting and thinking today?

After all, you only have to make a small mental effort for it to become clear that Russia is poor and wretched not because it has many parasites, not because it is being robbed by the central organs, but because our entire life has been built on erroneous and unnatural foundations.

Of itself the RSFSR's withdrawal from the USSR will not resolve a single Russian problem. Russia's sovereignty of itself resolves nothing. Without extirpating from Russian soil the roots of their troubles, independent Russians will be just as poor as they were when united in the union. Actually, Russia is not Lithuania: Vilnius can separate from Moscow, that is its right. But Moscow cannot separate from Moscow. That is unnatural, that is madness. Moscow can only return to its Muscovite history and free itself of what for a long time has prevented it from living and developing normally. All the rest is unnecessary complication, the temptations of a weak soul.

I have formed the impression that this moaning about Russia's impoverished life, this shouting about Russian sovereignty, comes largely from helplessness, from the lack of the skills of sober, specific thinking, from a reluctance to dig down to the real truth. Hence the persistent image of the enemy who is robbing the Russian man, hence the striking poverty of analysis and of thought about who we are, what has happened to us, and what we must do. Hence Russia's unthinking flight from Russia.

So far we have no Russian parliament capable of cutting through the tragic knot of Russian history. General D. Volkogonov's sober speech was a voice crying in the desert. He was applauded, but few people heeded him....

With the aid of the image of the enemy, using a few raucous slogans, it is possible to win the elections. But the ability to stir the crowd, to play on its dissatisfaction, to bring people out onto the square, is obviously not enough for the constructive transformation of Russia. Until a real multiparty system has formed in our country, until real competition between political programs and politicians begins, we are probably doomed to contemplate this meeting where each person still represents only himself.

Let us hope these are only growing pains.

Western Republics

Ukraine Parliament 'Negative' on Price Hikes

LD3005084190 Kiev International Service in English
2300 GMT 29 May 90

[Text] The parliament of the Ukraine has expressed a negative attitude to raising retail prices, which is envisaged by the government's concept of the transition to a market economy. The prices should not be raised unless

people are guaranteed reliable social protection and the question is agreed upon with the union republics, reads the statement adopted at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic.

The deputies entrusted the Council of Ministers of the Ukraine with the task to work out a package of draft laws which would guarantee Ukraine's transition toward a regulated market economy under reliable social protection of the population.

Ivashko Opposes Moscow Price Hike Plans

LD2905213190 Kiev International Service in English
2000 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] Today's session of the Ukraine's parliament was opened by the speech delivered by people's deputy, writer (Dmitro Pavlychko). He called upon his colleagues to revere the memory of outstanding Ukrainian writer Ivan Franko with a minute of silence, and place flowers at the monument to the writer in connection with the anniversary of his death.

Today, the deputies continued to discuss the report by head of the Ukraine's government, Vitail Masol, on the political, social, economic and ecological situation in the republic. He delivered that report earlier at the session. Here is what Vladimir Ivashko, people's deputy, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, said in this connection:

[Begin recording] [Ivashko in Ukrainian, fading into English translation] Social tensions emerged in the Ukraine and all over the country in recent days due to proposals of the USSR Government to raise retail prices for commodities and food products. The proposal evoked sharp response of millions of people. At this point I would like again to remind you of the stand taken by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, which had already been made public. We are deeply convinced that the transition to a regulated market economy is undoubtedly necessary. Under present-day conditions this is the only way out of the crisis, and it has no alternative. But unfortunately the USSR Government proposed to start with the raising of prices for those goods which had always been under the control of the state bodies. As you know, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine expressed its stand on the issue right after the first discussion of this question at the sitting of the Presidential Council and the Soviet [word indistinct]. According to this stand, the transition to market relations and the new system of price formation requires well-grounded studies and calculations, especially those concerning social after-effects, as well as the mechanism of compensation, protection of people's interests, broad explanation of the essence of the changes and their nationwide discussion.

Another approach will evidently be turned down by the people and will be fraught with serious social disturbances. [end recording]

Further on, Vladimir Ivashko said the following. I would like to draw the attention of the deputies to the following fact: We have an economic structure which is to be changed. This work is already being done by the government of the republic, which has just reported about its activities. But the current economic system involves the destinies of millions of people. Coal extraction, mining, metallurgy, chemistry, power engineering account for about two thirds of the entire volume of the republic's industrial production. Individual effort can hardly mend the situation in the above-mentioned industries as a whole. Then how can wages be increased for the workers engaged in those branches of our economy? This is something we must think about, taking into account both the situation in the republic and the developments in Moscow

I'm not calling upon you to discuss the report of the government; I think we're not yet ready for that. Moreover, I think that nobody is ready for such a quick reform. This is why I think we must avoid quick reforms so as not to undermine the entire society. But at the same time, of course, we must not reject as such the attempts of the government to introduce market economy.

If the deputies agree to my proposal, I think we must adopt a short resolution proceeding from what I said and from the sentiments of the population. These would be two items. First, the Supreme Soviet considers it inadmissible to adopt any decision on raising retail prices, including those for bread and baked products without broad discussion involving all union republics and a nationwide referendum. Secondly, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers should be entrusted to work out the stand of the Ukraine on questions concerning the holding of the price formation reform in the country, said Vladimir Ivashko.

The proposal by Vladimir Ivashko was adopted today by the majority of votes.

Deputies Assess Ivashko Speech

LD3005082390 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian
1800 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] [Announcer] What is the response to the speech of Volodymyr Ivashko, leader of the Ukrainian communists, of representatives of the two different currents, Deputy Stanislav Gurenko [second secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee] and Deputy Vyacheslav Chornovil [chairman of the Lvov Oblast soviet]

[Begin recording in Ukrainian, fading into English translation] [Gurenko] I would like to emphasize that what I am to express is my principled position. I have repeatedly withstood this position since it is the basis of my activities as a USSR people's deputy. I work there in the commission of social policies and prices and my activities have always been governed by one of the points of my prelection manifesto, namely that an unsubstantiated increase of prices for basic consumer goods will not

be accepted by the people at this time. I am aware that we shall get to the point, to such an event when prices will have to be raised, when all this will become a reality, but my view is that such a move has to be made after thorough substantiation so that the people understand the intention. I do not think that the move will be accepted unanimously, that all will applaud the rise of prices. In no other country it would be received in this way; in our country it wouldn't be either. However, as regards the compensation and social protection of whole groups of our population, then what is needed is a clear and understandable mechanism. And there is no need to link it with a switchover to market economy.

[Chornovil] I agree with Ivashko in that the decision of the USSR Government on an immediate introduction of so-called regulated market economy and raising prices for basic consumer goods is hasty and, to a degree, adventurist. It will lead merely to a greater colonial exploitation of the Ukraine because the plundering of its means by the center will be done at the expense of the population since centralization is still continuing in the country. Thus, I agree with Ivashko in this respect. I agree also that this may lead, and has already led, to a certain social tension in Ukraine.

But what does Ivashko propose? In his speech at the session he rejected the price increases and didn't advance anything instead. In other words, he remains to stand on the old conservative positions, striving to preserve everything as it is. We have to go over to market economy. The matter is that today we are not prepared for this type of economy. And that's what Ivashko had to admit. We cannot introduce market economy nor a greater vertical structure of dependence in economy without having in Ukraine a bank of our own, our own hard currency, without having any protection. [end recording]

Reportage on Belorussian Supreme Soviet

Resumes Work

LD2905210590 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 29 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today, after a nine-day interval, the first session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet resumed its work. Having discussed temporary standing orders, the deputies are moving on to set up the standing and temporary commissions of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

The next item on the agenda is a report from the Belorussian Council of Ministers on the work undertaken and the measures to eliminate the results of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

Elects Officials

*LD2905211190 Minsk ZVYAZDA in Belorussian
20 May 90 p 1*

[Summary] The Belorussian Supreme Soviet resolves:

To elect Nikolay Ivanovich Dementey as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. Comrade N.I. Dementey was born in 1931, Belorussian.

To elect Stanislav Stanislavovich Shushkevich as first deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet. Comrade S.S. Shushkevich was born in 1934, Belorussian.

To elect Vasily Ivanovich Shalodonov as deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet. He was born in 1948, Belorussian.

UN Envoy Elected

*LD2905211390 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian
1600 GMT 12 May 90*

[Summary] The Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has resolved:

To release Lev I. Maksimov from his post as permanent representative of the Belorussian SSR at the United Nations in connection with his retirement on pension.

To appoint Gennadiy Nikolayevich Buravkin to the above post and to release him from his post as chairman of the republic's state Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting.

Earthquake Shakes Moldavia, Buildings Damaged

*LD3005133990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1315 GMT 30 May 90*

[Text] Kishinev, 30 May (TASS)—The "Kishinev" Seismic Station registered an earthquake today at 1440 Moscow time [1040 GMT]. Its epicenter was in the Carpathians in the region of Vrancea on the territory of Romania at a depth of over 100 km. The force of the tremors in the Moldavian capital Kishinev was five-six points on the 12-point scale, and six-seven points in the south of the republic and at the epicenter zone. According to preliminary information, there has been damage to buildings in southern rayons of the republic.

Caucasus**Prudence Urged in Wake of 27 May Incidents**

*NC3005114390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
0900 GMT 30 May 90*

[Text] To the numerous hardships and tragedies borne by the Armenian people have been added two more. Scores of people were killed and many injured during the incidents which took place on 27 May at the Yerevan railway station and on the road leading to Nubarashen

[formerly Sovetashen]. To all this was added the earthquake on the same day, as a result of which buildings slated for (?reinforcement) were rendered unusable. Nearly 30,000 square meters of residential area became unusable in Gukasyanskiy Rayon alone.

It is obvious to all: Though it might be impossible to prevent natural disasters, the same cannot be said about human relations. In this very grave and difficult moment, when a day of mourning has been declared throughout the republic, when the flags are flying at halfmast, and when the incidents have engulfed all in sorrow and grief, the legitimate question arises: By whom and for what purpose was the 27 May tragedy organized? Yes, it was organized by some. [Words indistinct] It is obvious to all that there are culprits who cannot escape responsibility. As they say, hard times bring to surface much hypocrisy and chicanery. Let us hope that this very hard time will also reveal the names of those who abjectly shed human blood.

Was it not possible to avert all this? It was, if only some had heeded the voice of reason and not given in to emotions. What has been done cannot be undone and the mistake cannot be corrected. Now, the most important task is how to face the future. It must be understood for good that in order to exist and survive it is necessary to act with the utmost watchfulness. And, finally, everyone must fully realize that to sacrifice victims through such incidents will unwittingly divert us from our noble goals. Yet, the highest priority amongst the noble and sacred goals of the Armenian people remains the healing of the wounds in order to be able to confront future difficulties. The priority is to be [word indistinct] united.

Mourning Ceremonies Held in Yerevan

*NC3005113790 Yerevan International Service
in Armenian 1800 GMT 29 May 90*

[Text] Yerebuni Street and the road leading to Nubarashen [formerly Sovetashen]—where the painful incident took place on 27 May that also resulted in the death of peaceful citizens—has been overflowing with human waves since this morning. Yerebuni Street was also crowded like this in 1968 when the 2,750th anniversary of the establishment of our capital was being marked. Now, it is a mourning ceremony; there are black ribbons, flowers, and wreaths. The mourners have gathered to pay their last respects to the innocent victims. In the square nearby the Yerebuni Museum, they paid their last respects to all the innocent victims of the treacherously provoked incident.

Mourning ceremonies meetings were also held today in other districts of Yerevan.

Report on 27 May Spitak Earth Tremor

*NC2905115890 Yerevan ARMENPRES International
Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 28 May 90*

[Text] Yerevan 28 May (ARMENPRES)—Underground tremors have again made themselves felt in Spitak. A

tremor of around seven points struck here at 2328 local time [1828 GMT] on 27 May. Strong tremors were felt in the nearby cities and regions. The tremors measured up to 6.5 points in Kirovakan and Stepanavan, five in Leninakan, more than four in Artik and Razdan, and three in Yerevan. In Gukasyan the tremor reached seven points, as a result of which nearly 30,000 square meters of residential areas were rendered unusable.

The earthquake caused considerable damage to the cities and regions. According to the reports from Kirovakan, some of the buildings which were damaged during the December 1988 earthquake and were slated for reinforcement have become unusable. The city's underground communication lines, including water pipes, sewers, and main gas pipelines in some places, have been destroyed and the power supply system has been disrupted.

The residents of Spitak and the members of the construction teams engaged in restoration work there passed an uneasy night. People did not disperse until 0300. It became necessary to house some of the population in temporary dwellings.

According to information coming in from various places, no one was killed or injured.

Armenia's Place in Renewed Federation Examined

NC1905114290 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
0500 GMT 19 May 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The paper reports that a consultative meeting of the secretaries of the republican [word indistinct] party organizations took place yesterday at the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee [CPCC].

Vladimir Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian CPCC, addressed the meeting. He briefed those present on the situation in the republic and touched upon the urgent problems facing the party organizations. He said: Lately, particularly in connection with the upcoming election, the issue of the future of our republic and its political structure has often been raised. It must be clear to any sober thinker that Armenia's future lies in political sovereignty, economic independence, and autonomy within the framework of a renewed Soviet federation; it lies in economic and land [word indistinct] reform and in the radical restructuring of the national economy and its system of management.

Convoy Reportedly Stoned in Mardakartskiy Rayon

NC3005115590 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 29 May 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The newspapers report that the situation on the roads in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast is still tense. A vehicle in a convoy traveling on the

motorway linking Kel'badzhar, Mardakert, and Mirbeshir was pelted with stones as the vehicles drove close to the Ashagy (?Orafat) residential area in Mardakertskiy Rayon on 26 May. Three of the Armenians who were involved in the attack were arrested and sent to the Mardakertskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department. There were also other incidents.

The KOMMUNIST, BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, and VYSHKA newspapers published detailed information on these and other incidents.

Report on Celebration of Azerbaijan Statehood

LD2805234190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 28 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] For the first time, the day of the rebirth of Azerbaijan statehood was solemnly marked in Baku today.

[M. Mamedov video report opens to the sound of lively music with shots of a fortress atop which a flag, blue, red and yellow horizontal fields with crescent and star, is hoisted, street scenes shown] [Mamedov] This march, in honor of the rebirth of the Azerbaijan state more than 70 years ago by the eminent Azerbaijan composer Uzeir Gadzhibekov and which has not been performed for practically all these years, was again heard in the squares and streets of the city. On 28 May 1918, the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic was proclaimed, one of the first in the East. [video shows street scenes, shot of crowd gathered in a street applauding below another Azerbaijan flag]

A meeting today outside the building, where meetings of the parliament of this republic were held, was devoted to this notable event in the history of Azerbaijan. The flags and symbols of the democratic republic, now officially recognized as the national possession of the Azerbaijan people were hung out for the first time.

Speakers noted that despite the short period of its existence, only 23 months, the government of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic implemented a number of progressive measures in the sphere of sociopolitical life and culture. Baku University was opened, hundreds of young people were sent abroad to study, and measures were taken to eliminate illiteracy.

Much was done in the parliament of this republic, which included 11 different parties, fractions and groups, to preserve the territorial integrity and guarantee the sovereignty of Azerbaijan. In honor of this memorable date, a memorial plaque was today installed on the building which currently houses the Institute of Literacy of the republic's Academy of Sciences. [video shows this plaque which bears the inscription: "In 1918-1920 this building housed the parliament of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic"]

Azerbaijan Troops Send Appeal to Gorbachev*LD2905165390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 29 May 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Presenter] An appeal by servicemen to the president of the USSR.

A general meeting of servicemen of the internal troops and officials of the Internal Affairs bodies of the Commandant's Office of the region under the state of emergency in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and adjacent rayons of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has taken place in Baku. An appeal to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR, was adopted. The documents says in part:

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich. We, servicemen of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] and officials of the Internal Affairs bodies, carrying out the governmental task of guarding public order in the region of the state of emergency in NKAO and adjacent rayons of the Azerbaijan SSR, again appeal to you. This is a result, above all, of the fact that shots are again being fired in the streets of Stepanakert. Again, Armenian terrorists are guilty of shedding the blood of our comrades. The firing from an automatic weapon, in broad daylight, on a bus carrying officials of an operational investigative group of the USSR MVD in the city center, and brazen armed attacks on checkpoints and posts used for the maintenance of public order have resulted in the death of our combat friend, a Russian and a regular soldier, Vladimir Valentinovich Kirillov, and in the wounding of five servicemen of the Internal Troops.

There is yet another piece of sorrowful news from Yerevan. The vicious bullet of Armenian terrorists has cut short the life of our former colleague, Lieutenant Colonel (Vyacheslav Nikolayevich Chekmarev). The courageous officer trod the harsh roads of Afghanistan for two fiery years, but he died, in peacetime, at the hands of base murderers.

We realize the whole complexity and responsibility of the tasks laid upon us, and despite all the difficulties, we are ready staunchly to endure all the burdens and deprivations of military service, to spare neither our blood nor our lives to defend the peaceful labor of Soviet people, regardless of their national affiliation.

But we are profoundly indignant, the appeal goes on to say, at the inactivity of the Armenian SSR leadership, which calmly views the excesses being committed by terrorists, who, for some reason, are called militiamen, which is undoubtedly having a negative effect on the sociopolitical situation in the NKAO.

We want, no, we demand the truth: The truth about who benefits from new victims among servicemen and the civilian population; the truth about who is leading the Armenian people to the abyss, hiding behind national

interests; and truth and objectivity in the appraisal of the activity of the Internal Troops. We are certain that those who are to blame for the exacerbation of interethnic relations must be brought most strictly to book, the appeal states.

Elections to Armenian Supreme Soviet Held*LD2305021590 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT
22 May 90*

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert May 23 TASS—The confrontation between the Armenian and Azeri communities in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region has not ceased, despite the apparent quiet. The Armenian community in Nagorno-Karabakh keeps aloof from any contacts with representatives of the Azerbaijani leadership headed by Second Secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Viacheslav Polianichko, who have been staying in Stepanakert for four months already.

Armenians have also declined to send their representatives, on a parity basis, to the republican organizing committee for the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region, which, according to the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet of November 28, 1989, was set up to recreate the regional power structures abolished in January 1989 in connection with the introduction of a special administrative committee for the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region. The Azerbaijani government is seeking, according to frequent statements in the press, to restore the republican sovereignty in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region, and reenact the constitution of Azerbaijan on Nagorno-Karabakh territory.

The Armenian side undertook another action a few days ago. Elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Republic were held in Nagorno-Karabakh. According to Armenians, these elections were in fact a referendum which reconfirmed the right to independence.

But while the election of representatives of the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region to the Armenian parliament in constituencies of the Armenian republic is not prohibited by the Soviet Constitution, the establishment of constituencies in another republic—twelve such constituencies were established in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous regions—is at variance with Article 76 of the Soviet Constitution, under which a Union republic exercises state authority only on its own territory. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet recognised the action as illegal on March 3, 1990. The Presidium of the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic and its Council of Ministers issued resolutions on the same score but this does not alter the organisers' intentions.

Long before the day of the elections, the military commandant of the emergency area, Major-General Safonov, issued a warning to the organisers and the population

was notified about the illegality and inadmissibility of participating in the elections.

Before the election day, according to the commandant's office, 12,000 election tickets and proclamations delivered from Yerevan were seized at the Stepanakert airport. On May 19 and 20, the airport was closed, and four people with voting boxes were detained late on May 19 while going from house to house soliciting votes. Some of the supposed organizers and candidates for deputies were placed under house arrest. On May 20 possible polling stations were patrolled by troops.

However, the elections were carried through. Ballots were cast in courtyards and apartments visited by organizers. S. Sarkisian, one of the leaders of the Miatsum (Unification) organisation, disbanded after the introduction of the state of emergency, told TASS that most inhabitants of Stepanakert, excepting families of servicemen and the Azerbaijani population, took part in the elections.

According to Deputy Chief of the Political Department of the Military Commandant's Office of the area under the state of emergency of the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region and adjacent districts of the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic, Subcolonel Ostrovsky, the elections served to widen the rift between the two peoples and can in no way facilitate the normalization. He said the organizers of the elections were well aware of the fact.

The instability of the social and political situation influenced the criminogenic situation: Shooting increased in population centres. Military patrols have been shot at. Illegal activities have been stepped up on the roads.

According to the Military Commandant's Office, a stretch of the motor road between Armenian Askeran and Azeri Hodjally was destroyed by an explosion in the early hours of May 20.

Airstrip at Mardakertskiy Rayon Closed

*NC2905133690 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 24 May 90*

[Tex] Mardakert—The uncontrolled flights of aircraft and helicopters from Armenia have been halted and the secret runway in Mardakertskiy Rayon has been closed down. The decision to this effect was adopted after aviation experts expressed the view that the use of this airstrip, the establishment of which violated all norms, will endanger future flights and the daily life of the citizens in residential areas in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

It became clear from the [word indistinct] of the Azerbaijan civil aviation committee, which was signed today, that the said airstrip was not planned as an airport which would accommodate incoming and outgoing flights. Nor was it registered anywhere. Furthermore, it was not equipped with telecommunications and [word indistinct] equipment. The airstrip violated the USSR's aviation code.